DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 157 EC 122 193

AUTHOR	Carr, Andrea
TITLE	Final Report on Analysis of Child Maltreatment-Juvenile Misconduct Association in Eight New York Counties.
INSTITUTION	Rhode Island Univ., Kingston.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (DHEW/OHD), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	20 Oct 77
GRANT	90-C425
NOTE	144p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Records: *Child Abuse: *Delinquency: Exceptional Child Research: *Family Relationship: Incidence: *Neglected Children: Parent Child Relationship: *Social Agencies: Social Influences
IDENTIFIERS	Final Reports

ABSTRACT

Three sections comprise the final report of a project on defining and classifying the connections between child abuse and neglect and later juvenile misconduct. The first paper reports preliminary findings from a search of records from eight New York counties identifying maltreated children in 1951 or 1952 and considers the influence of four background variables: sex, religion, ethnicity, and family composition (population per household, out of wedlock birth, and parental presence in the home). A second paper examines family composition and its relationship to child maltreatment and juvenile delinquency. Among findings revealed were that being born in wedlock appeared to be associated with being an abused delinquent: the presence of a paramour in the home was associated with being a maltreated delinquent: and that a child from a large, female headed family was more likely to be a maltreated delinquent. The final section considers the effects of disposition patterns of cases on later contact with juvenile corrections agencies. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

90-C-425
Part II
ED180157

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT ON ANALYSIS OF CHILD MALTREATMENT - JUVENILE MISCONDUCT ASSOCIATION IN EIGHT NEW YORK COUNTIES

Andréa Carr

University of Rhode Island

Final Report Submitted to:

NATIONAL CENTER ON CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

Children's Bureau/Administration on Children Youth and Families

Office of Human Development Services/Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Research Supported by Grant Number 90-C425

Principal Investigator: Richard J. Gelles

HC 000193

Our Final Report on the New York portion of our overall project on defining and classifying child abuse and neglect is a set of three separate reports, integrated by the general purpose of our research efforts in this part of our analysis: to understand better the factors related to a child being in contact with officials for being maltreated early in his or her life and then later becoming involved again with officials for juvenile misconduct.

Our analysis was a secondary analysis of data provided to us by Jose Alfaro of the New York Select Committee on Child Abuse and Neglect. Our first problem, then, was to prepare the data for the analysis we had proposed. We did not know at the time we proposed the analysis that data on the multiple contacts of the sample children with various agencies were not time-ordered. As we were interested in relating early child maltreatment with later juvenile misconduct, our first task was to time-order the data on agency contacts. This proved to be a cumbersome task as some children had as many as 21 agency contacts.

Having time-ordered the data on agency contacts, we were able to provide a somewhat more precise estimate of the association between being reported early in life for child maltreatment and then later being reported for a juvenile offense. These results were presented in our first report to the Administration for Children, Youth and Families: National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (included here, as Section One of this Final Report). In that report we also presented some preliminary results on the affects of background characteristics of the children (and their families) reportedly maltreated on the likelihood of the children later having an official contact with agencies for juvenile offenses.

We examined, in that early report, the length of time children spend "in the system," both for maltreatment agency contacts and for juvenile contacts. In that part of our analysis we examine some selected differences in the length of time in the system for males and females, and for Blacks and whites.

Our examination of the association between background characteristics and the probability of a child having an early contact for maltreatment and a later contact as a juvenile offender led us to more carefully examine the affects of various family composition variables on child maltreatment contacts and/or juvenile contacts. We examined the impact of parental presence or absence in the home, the presence of various other household members (particularly paramours), family size, and some combinations of these variables that represent "types of families." The results of that portion of our analysis were presented at the Third Annual Meetings of the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect in April in New York. They are included as Section Two of this Final Report.

Our first report (Section One, here) suggested that several factors would affect the <u>possibility</u> of finding an empirical association between early child maltreatment and later juvenile misconduct in data of the nature used in this research: 1) loss of official records; 2) the death and/or institutionalization of an abused child; 3) inter-county migration of families; and, 4) the eligibility of a child (in terms of age), at any particular contact, for a juvenile contact. We had not, at that time, been able to control for age of "eligibility." In our final research results (Section Three of this Final Report), we examined the impact of this fourth factor on the association empirically found in the New York data set.

Our originally proposed analysis also was designed to examine the affect of various case dispositions on the likelihood of further agency contacts, particularly contact patterns that involved an early contact for child maltreatment and a later contact as a juvenile offender. The results of this phase of our research are also presented in Section Three of this Final Report. In fact, we were able to go a step further and examine the association between patterns of case dispositions (where there had been at least three contacts) on the likelihood of a child having an early contact for child maltreatment and a later contact for juvenile misconduct.

Our Final Report on the New York analysis contains, then, three sections. Two of these sections have previously been presented: 1) Section One -- "Some Preliminary Findings on the Association Between Child Maltreatment and Juvenile Misconduct in Eight New York Counties;" and, 2) Section Two -- "Family Composition and Its Relation to Child Maltreatment and Juvenile Delinquency." Section Three of this Final Report, "Refinements on the Relationship Between Being Reported as a Maltreated Child and Later Being Reported as a Juvenile Offender," consists of research results not previously disseminated.

SECTION ONE

Some Preliminary Findings on the Association Between Child Maltreatment and Juvenile Misconduct in Eight New York Counties

A Report to the Administration
for Children, Youth and Families:
National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect

by
Andréa Carr
University of Rhode Island
October 20, 1977

CONFIDENTIAL
Not For Publication

Not for publication or duplication: Andréa Carr
University of Rhode Island
Kingston, RI

Contents

I. Introduction

II. Assessing the Strength of the Relationships Between Child Maltreatment and Juvenile Misconduct in New York.

III. The Affects of Background Characteristics on Maltreated Children and on Those Maltreated Children with Juvenile Contacts.

Background Variables.
1. Sex
2. Religion
3. Ethnicity.
4. Family Composition.
   Population per Household.
   Out-of-Wedlock Birth.
   Parental Presence in the Home.

IV. Time in the System.

Bibliography

INTRODUCTION

This Report is based on official records data collected in eight New York counties (Alfaro, 1973) and uses only the "1950 sample" of that data set. This sample of children was obtained by searching county records and selecting all children in each of eight New York counties who were reported as maltreated in either 1951 or 1952.[1] County records were then searched, forward through the early 1970s and backward as far as county records permitted, for any other official contacts the sample children may have had for either maltreatment or for juvenile offenses (see Alfaro, 1973).

A previous analysis (Alfaro, 1977) has revealed the empirical association in these data between official maltreatment contacts and official juvenile misconduct contacts. The present Report selectively extends that analysis by assessing the strength of the revealed association between reported maltreatment and juvenile misconduct, by examining the affect of selected background characteristics of the children on this empirically-found association between reported maltreatment and juvenile misconduct, and by examining the length of time the sample children remain in contact with the social service system(s).

---

[1] Siblings of children officially reported maltreated were also included in the sample. And, as two counties processed very large numbers of reports, it was deemed cost-prohibitive in these two counties to sample for an entire year -- three months were selected, April, July, and February. Finally, as county record keeping varied widely (see Alfaro, 1973), we have grouped the counties into high and low "contact-per-child" counties, based on the overall mean number of contacts per child.

Assessing the Strength of the Relationship Between Child Maltreatment and Juvenile Misconduct in New York

Jose Alfaro (1977) has examined a sample of 4465 children and their siblings who had contacts for child maltreatment in the early 1950s with official agencies in eight New York counties. Using these data he has demonstrated the relationship between reported child maltreatment contacts and official contacts the sample children had for juvenile misconduct (juvenile delinquency -- JD -- and persons in need of supervision --PINS) through the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s. Alfaro finds relationships ranging from about 10% to nearly 30% (Table 1) between early contacts for child maltreatment and later agency contacts for various categories of juvenile misconduct.[2]

Since siblings of those reported as maltreated are included in the sample, and assuming that even exposure to violence in the home may be associated with juvenile misbehavior, we have included those children with only juvenile contacts (Table 1) to arrive at a total empirically found relationship between officially reported child maltreatment and juvenile misconduct. The relationship between these two types of contact range from 9% in Suffolk county to 30% in Monroe county.

The relationship for all eight counties is 20%. That is, one in five sample children who had child maltreatment contacts (or were siblings) were later officially reported as delinquent or in need of supervision. If no relationship actually existed we might still by chance or error expect to find perhaps a 5% relationship. If juvenile contacts among

---

[2] In this section of the report we have included "sexual abuse" as maltreatment in order that our results be comparable with Alfaro's (1977) analysis. However, we have excluded this form of maltreatment in subsequent sections, as we feel it is a special form of maltreatment.

the general population of children (maltreated or not) were known we might be better able to assess the strength of the approximately 20% empirically demonstrated relationship in Table 1.

The relationships presented in Table 1 have not taken into account the validity of the official maltreatment report. If an association between maltreatment and juvenile misconduct exists, then those children with valid official maltreatment contacts would be expected to show an even higher percentage of children with both maltreatment and juvenile contacts. In Table 2 we compare the relationship between maltreatment contacts and juvenile contacts: a) for all 1950 sample children; and, b) for those 1950 sample children with at least one valid maltreatment contact. Surprisingly, there is little difference. Only in New York county does the relationship increase by more than 2 or 3 percent, and even there the increase is only about 4 percent. Perhaps, Table 2 should include, in addition, only valid officially reported juvenile contacts. Or, perhaps, mere contact with official agencies is a "validating" experience in itself.

Without population data it is possible to delineate four general factors that make this seemingly high relationship clearly a conservative estimate of the actual relationship:

1. The New York data are entirely official records data. And, such records are often lost through fires, purposeful destruction, administrative policy changes, etc. We have explicitly recognized this problem by separating the counties into high and low "average contact-per-child" counties. More importantly, a child may have an official maltreatment contact and later engage in juvenile misconduct but not be officially recorded as such. Thus, our

estimate is an underestimate of any relationship that might actually exist in the eight counties.

2. Some children may be so seriously abused that they die or are institutionalized for life. These children, then, will not later have official contacts for juvenile misbehavior. Thus, again, the 20% relationship underestimates the true association between official maltreatment contacts and official juvenile misconduct contacts. As 1% of the New York sample children died of maltreatment we can partially estimate the conservatism introduced by these factors.

3. The sampling design was intra-county (see Alfaro, 1973). That is, official records within each county only were searched. Thus, migration patterns impose limits on the relationship that can be found. Some children who have been officially found maltreated in a non-sample county will move into a sample county, and, perhaps, be recorded as delinquency contacts only. Other children included in the sample because they had maltreatment contacts in the early 1950s may move out of the county and have juvenile contacts. Yet these children, <u>in this data</u>, will appear to show no association between maltreatment and juvenile misconduct.

Table 3 attempts, crudely, to estimate the affect of migration on the relationship between early and later contacts. Counties with high

net migrations should show relatively low relationships between maltreatment and juvenile misconduct, other things being equal. Generally, this is born out as of the four counties with relatively high net migration (in or out) three do show relatively low relationships. Westchester county seems to be, to some degree, an exception.

4. Finally, and not mutually exclusive from the migration pattern problem, the possible relationships are understated by statute limitations on the age of eligibility for delinquency and PINS contacts. For most of the period covered by the data children were eligible for JD and/or PINS contacts only if they were between 7 and 17 years of age. If a child were included in the sample because of a maltreatment contact at age 1, he would not even be eligible for a delinquency contact for six years. A sibling included in the sample might already be 18 and thus never eligible. Indeed, at any given contact some of the children will not be eligible for juvenile contacts by virtue of their age. And, some children have fewer official contacts than others.

Table 4, therefore, presents both the percent of children no longer available (they have no further official contacts) and, for those with a given contact, the percentage eligible for juvenile contacts. In the low contact counties most children have two or fewer contacts and the percentage eligible varies widely as the percent base drops

dramatically after contact two. Among high contact counties, New York and Erie counties consistently, from contact two through five, have smaller percentages of children eligible for juvenile contacts, thus reducing the possible relationship between maltreatment and juvenile contacts. And, New York is the county that shows the lowest empirically found relationship among these high contact counties (Tables 1 and 2). Erie county appears to be an exception, perhaps explained by relatively high population increase (Table 3) or other factors not presently available.

The Affects of Background Characteristics on Maltreated Children and on Those Maltreated Children with Juvenile Contacts

Official records data collected on children who were identified by official agencies as victims of maltreatment in the early 1950s (Jose Alfaro, 1977) provides selected background information on a sample of 4463 children. In this section, we address two questions: 1) do children with official maltreatment contacts (the 1950 sample children) differ in background characteristics from the general population of children (in the eight counties sampled)? and, 2) do the subset of children with maltreatment contacts and either delinquency (JD) or status offense contacts (PINS) differ in background from those children with only maltreatment contacts?

This is an exploratory examination of the background characteristics of children officially labelled "maltreated." Children are classified in terms of the nature of their contact with official agencies.[3] Children with official contacts for maltreatment and juvenile misbehavior have been divided into two groups: 1) maltreated children who also had delinquency contacts (JD); and, 2) maltreated children who also had status offense contacts (PINS). It is important to note that these two categories of children are not mutually exclusive: a maltreated child with a delinquency contact may also have had a PINS contact, and a maltreated child with a PINS contact may also have had a delinquency contact. We intend, later, to examine children by looking at mutually exclusive categories, but time constraints preclude such examination at present.

The data on child maltreatment and juvenile delinquency in New York are

---

[3] Classification is based on only the first referral reason in the data--as many as seven are listed for some contacts.

based entirely on official records (Alfaro, 1973). Thus, only a limited set of background characteristics is available for each child. Specifically, we have data on the sex, ethnicity and religion of each child. Additionally, we have data on the presence of the mother and father in the home at the time of contact, the number of persons in the household, and whether the child was born out-of-wedlock. These data (see Table 5) are remarkably complete, with the exception of ethnicity where data are missing for nearly 15 percent of the children.[4]

Background Variables. While causal inference is premature, all variables (except "presence of parents in the home") are likely to be prior in time to any of the incidents leading these children in the sample to being identified by official agencies as maltreated. The presence of parents in the home is at least contemporaneous with such incidents. For some of the variables we have corresponding population data on the eight sample counties for comparison, a reasonable control group (although the general population includes maltreated children). We will explore the relationship between these background characteristics and contact for maltreatment and contact for both maltreatment and juvenile misconduct.

1. Sex. In the literature a consistent finding is that boys are more likely than girls to be physically abused (Straus, 1971; Gelles, 1977:21). Gelles' figures (1977) are based on a nationally representative sample of intact families. Among those children in New York who had contact with official agencies for maltreatment in the 1950s we find no difference by sex (Table 6).

---

[4] One county -- Broome -- is primarily responsible for this relatively high rate of missing data among low contact-per-child counties. Among high contact-per-child counties both Erie and Monroe contribute relatively heavily -- 20% to 25% -- to the overall rate of missing data on ethnicity.

One reason our results are different from Gelles' is that our sample is not representative and maltreatment is not simply violence, but also includes behaviors which might better be called "child neglect." However, even when we look at child abuse (defined as physical attacks or serious risk thereof) we find boys no more likely to be abused than girls.[5] The percentages of boys and girls among the New York sample of maltreated children are much the same as similar percentages for the general population in every sample county.

However, there is a major difference between boys and girls when we consider maltreated children who also had juvenile contacts. In every county, boys are much more likely than girls to exhibit a pattern of maltreatment and delinquency. And, this is especially true in low contact-per-child counties (Table 6).

The affect of sex on maltreatment and status offenses (PINS) types of contacts is less clear. In three of the four high contact counties girls are somewhat more likely than boys to exhibit this pattern of contacts. But the difference is quite small. In low contact counties sex appears to be unrelated to contact types involving maltreatment and PINS.

In sum, the proportion of boys and girls among the maltreated sample appears much like that of boys and girls in the general population. And, the fact that being a boy is more highly associated with maltreatment and delinquency patterns of contacts may very well only reflect that boys, in the general population, are more likely to be officially tagged as delinquent than are girls. Sex, in this data, then, appears to be unrelated to having an

---

[5] Although these data are not presented, we have examined abuse (defined as physical harm or risk thereof) and neglect separately. From time to time we will report on these findings but the number of tables involved precludes our presenting them here.

official contact for maltreatment or, among those with maltreatment contacts, to having a contact for delinquency or status offenses.

2. Religion. To the extent that religion has been assessed in child abuse literature, any relationship tends to reflect marginality rather than an attribute of the religion. We do not have data on the distribution of religion in the general population of these eight counties, and such data would be necessary to assess the marginality of a particular religious group in any particular county.[6] And, in any event, a careful examination of our data reveals that, on the whole, membership in any particular religion does not appear to be associated with children being officially recorded as maltreated, or with the officially labelled maltreated children in the sample also having official juvenile contacts.

3. Ethnicity. More child abuse is found among lower socio-economic families than higher socio-economic families (Gelles, 1977). But, the "cause" of this association is unclear. Some argue families of lower socio-economic status are more violent, while others argue that poverty and lack of status subject such families to greater stress. Some point to the relative isolation of the poor, while others note that close, dense neighborhoods and the attention of social service agencies to such families merely increases their chances of being seen and "caught" as child abusers. Perhaps, social service personnel have come to expect such behavior from these families and are more willing to see a particular overt behavior as abuse, And, perhaps the "cause" is several, or "all" of these factors.

---

[6] Tables on religion are not included here, see footnote 5.

We have no indicator of socio-economic status in the data on background characteristics. But, we do know that the non-white population in this country is highly over-represented among the poor. Following on the research on SES and child abuse, we would expect that non-whites would be proportionately more likely to be reported as maltreated children than whites. It is also well established that non-whites are proportionately more likely to come to official attention for juvenile misconduct than are whites. But, are non-whites even more likely to have both maltreatment and delinquency or status offenses contacts with official agencies?

Table 7 confirms that non-whites are disproportionately represented among the 1950 sample of children selected because they were officially in contact with agencies for maltreatment, or were the siblings of such children. In all but one county with a substantial non-white population, the non-white percentage among the reported maltreated children is about double the percentage of non-whites in the most recent population year -- 1970. And, in New York county this percentage reaches a level where "ceiling effects" make it unlikely that it could be higher: while a fifth of New York county's population is non-white, nearly two-thirds of the 1950 sample children are non-white.

In two counties --Kings and Monroe -- non-whites are not only disproportionately represented among children with maltreatment contacts, but are substantially more disproportionately represented among children with both maltreatment and juvenile contacts, especially delinquency contacts. And, in all high contact-per-child counties at least one of the interaction contact patterns -- maltreatment and JD, or maltreatment and PINS -- shows a higher percentage of non-whites than the percentage of non-whites among all maltreated children in the 1950 sample. In low contact-per-child counties the low

proportion of non-whites in the population and the degree of missing data on ethnicity (see Table 5) make interpretation of data impossible.

In short, being non-white increases one's chances of being officially recorded as maltreated, but more importantly ethnicity also appears to increase one's chances of being reported as maltreated and delinquent or in need of supervision (PINS). At this point, we can only report that being non-white increases one's chances of being officially tagged, for maltreatment and even more so (in some counties, at least) for maltreatment and juvenile misconduct.

4. Family Composition. Researchers investigating child abuse and delinquen have argued that various aspects of family composition affect these two behaviors. Gelles (1977) observes a repeated finding in child abuse research is the positive association between child abuse and family size (see also, Gil, 1971:644). Many have suggested that pregnancies occurring before marriage or early in a marriage may reflect an unwanted pregnancy or a severe stress on an already stressful relationship. And, premarital pregnancies, unwanted pregnancies and children born out-of-wedlock have been shown to be associated with child abuse (Zalba, 1971:59; Bennie and Sclare, 1969:975; and Wasserman, 1967:177). Finally, abused children have been shown to disproportionately come from female-headed households (Gil, 1971:664).

Population per Household. A positive association between family size and child abuse appears to be a consistent finding in the child abuse research (Gelles, 1977). In Table 8 this consistent finding is confirmed in our sample data. When compared to the general population of these eight counties, the families in the sample of maltreated children are always twice as large, and often as much as three times as large as the average family size in the

populations of these counties. And, this conclusion appears to hold equally for high and low contact-per-child counties.

In high contact-per-child counties those maltreated children who also have official contacts for delinquency and/or PINS tend to come from even larger families than do those children who are in the total 1950 sample. In low contact counties there are not enough cases for a realistic assessment of the impact of family size on the chances of the sample children having maltreatment contacts or of having two types of contacts -- maltreatment and juvenile contacts.

It appears that the data presented here support the previously found association between family size and child abuse. But, Table 8 goes further by suggesting that coming from a large family may increase the chances of being officially in contact with official agencies over a longer time and for more types of contacts -- both maltreatment and juvenile offenses. Perhaps, large families are more known and visible and therefore more likely to come to official attention for any given type of behavior. Or, possibly large families are simply more stressful social settings.

Out-of-Wedlock Birth. It has been shown that children born out-of-wedlock are more likely to be abused than other children. Table 9 clearly shows that a disproportionate number of children in the 1950 sample (selected primarily because they had maltreatment contacts in the early 1950s) were born out-of-wedlock, when compared with children in the general population of these eight counties. And, in low contact counties this is even more apparent: more than three times as many children were born out-of-wedlock among those with maltreatment contacts than in the general population.

Yet, a central issue in this research is the relationship between maltreatment contacts and juvenile misconduct contacts. The literature does not address

the question of whether an unwanted pregnancy increases or decreases the association between maltreatment contacts and juvenile misconduct contacts. The number of children in low contact counties with both maltreatment contacts and juvenile contacts precludes our assessing the affect of out-of-wedlock birth on these children. Yet, they are more likely than children in the general population to be born out-of-wedlock.

In high contact counties, the evidence generally suggests only that being born out-of-wedlock increases the probability of having official contact for maltreatment. With the exception of children in New York county with maltreatment contacts and PINS contacts, children with both types of contacts are no more likely to have been born out-of-wedlock. Children with both maltreatment and juvenile contacts are, however, about as likely as other maltreated children (or their siblings) to be born out-of-wedlock.

In New York county it is interesting to speculate about why it is children with maltreatment and PINS contacts, and not maltreatment and JD contacts who are much more likely to be born out-of-wedlock. Perhaps, status offenses are typical of children not just born out-of-wedlock, not just children of unwanted pregnancies, but truly unwanted children.

Parental Presence in the Home. While we do not have comparative population figures on the presence or absence of mothers and fathers among families in the eight New York counties, our finding that 41 percent of the fathers are absent (Table 10) does seem high. It seems likely that the 1950 sample children are less likely to be living with their fathers than children in general. Whether 15 percent of the mothers being absent is disproportionately high is more difficult to assess: children often do live with other relatives, more and more frequently live with their fathers only, and certainly among those children with

valid maltreatment contacts many (although less than might be expected -- see Alfaro, 1977) are placed in foster homes and institutional settings.

Still, two things are particularly noteworthy in Table 10. First, the absence of either a mother or father does not appear to be more prevalent among children with both types of contacts -- maltreatment and juvenile. Second, in the high contact-per-child counties, more so than in the low contact counties, mothers and fathers are more likely to be present among the total 1950 sample children with both maltreatment and juvenile contacts. And, this is especially true for mothers -- in keeping perhaps with the finding that child abuse is more prevalent in female-headed households. The high contact-per-child counties seem more affected by ethnicity than low contact counties (Table 7). And, now, we find that low contact counties appear more affected by this family composition variable -- the absence of the parents, especially the mother. Further exploration is clearly indicated.

Time in the System

Approximately two fifths of the 1950 sample children had only one official contact whether for maltreatment or for juvenile misconduct. It should be remembered that having only one officially recorded contact, in these data, is a conservative estimate of the actual number of official contacts: some official records are lost or destroyed; and, the intra-county sampling design further suggests that some official contacts may occur in another county and thus not be recorded in these data.

For the nearly 60 percent of the sample with two or more contacts, our initial results indicate that, overall, the children remained in the system an average of six years (Table 11). Children with only maltreatment contacts, or only juvenile contacts similarly tended to remain in the system about 5 or 6 years. Children with both maltreatment and juvenile contacts (about 20 percent of the 1950 sample - see Table 1) remain in the system longer -- in most counties four to five years longer. This, of course, is not a surprising result, but we intend to examine this result in terms of background characteristics, validity and dispositions in order to better understand the exact meaning.

Table 11 is also a bit unusual in that, unlike many of the "by-county" data we have previously presented, the data do not vary by the county subgroups we have formed based on "contacts-per-child." There is a great deal of county

---

7 This also means that they could have behaved in ways or may have been subject to behavior which might have put them at risk of official contacts. Nevertheless, there is only one contact recorded in these data.

variation in the average time in the system, but it does not appear related to the number of contacts. We intend next to explicitly examine the time in the system by the actual number (and type) of contacts a child has.

It might be expected that boys, once in contact with official agencies, might be watched more closely and therefore spend, on the average, more time in the system. In Table 12, we see this is not so, at least for those with two or more contacts.[8] There are counties where boys, particularly if they have interaction contact patterns -- maltreatment and juvenile contacts -- are likely to be in the system longer.[9] Still, this is not a consistent finding, but rather a finding limited to specific counties and specific contact patterns.

It can be similarly argued that non-whites might be engulfed by the system for longer periods of time than whites. Their resources for avoiding the system may be more restricted and expectations on the part of social service agencies may expose non-whites to greater risk of repeated official contacts. In Table 13 it is clear that among those children with only maltreatment contacts, our expectation is not met -- except for selected counties with small numbers of children, non-whites are "in the system" for about the same average length of time as are white children. However, among those children with both maltreatment and juvenile contacts -- interaction patterns -- non-whites are in the system longer, on the average, in the seven counties where a comparison can be made. And, it appears to be more than an entire year longer in nearly every case.

---

[8] Girls may be more likely to have only one official contact, but time constraints preclude our reporting data to support or deny this contention.

[9] See Broome, Kings and Monroe counties, particularly "interaction" patterns.

These tables, then, suggest that the length of time spent in the official social service system of these eight New York counties depends on having both maltreatment contacts and juvenile contacts. Further, Table 13 suggests that at least some background characteristics tend to increase the time in the system for those with both types of official contact -- maltreatment and juvenile.

The small N's for the "juvenile contacts only" pattern is a result of the sample design.[10] However, we can, and will, repeat the analysis using the New York 1970 sample in order to better assess whether "juvenile contacts only" tend to keep children in the system longer than do "maltreatment contacts only."

---

[10] The New York 1950 sample was selected because the children had official contacts for maltreatment, or were the siblings of children who did. The New York 1970 sample was selected because the children included had official contacts for juvenile misconduct. There will, therefore, be more children in 1970 sample with "juvenile contacts only."

Bibliography

Alfaro, J.
1973 Report on the Feasibility of Studying the Relationship Between Child Abuse and Later Socially Deviant Behavior. Unpublished Report, New York: New York State Assembly Select Committee on Child Abuse (August).

_____
1977 Report on the Relationship Between Child Abuse and Neglect and Later Socially Deviant Behavior. Uncorrected draft of a paper presented at a symposium, Exploring the Relationship Between Child Abuse and Delinquency, Seattle: University of Washington (July 21 and 22).

Bennie, E. and Sclare, A.
1969 The Battered Child Syndrome. American J. Psychiat. 125(7): 975-979.

Gelles, R.
1977 Etiology of Violence: Overcoming Fallacious Reasoning In Understanding Family Violence And Child Abuse. Presented at a Symposium, "Child Abuse: Where Do We Go From Here?" Washington, D.C.: Children's Hospital National Medical Center (February).

Gil, D.
1971 Violence Against Children. J. Marr. Fam. 33(Nov.):637-657.

Straus, M.
1971 Some Social Antecedents of Physical Punishment: A Linkage Theory Interpretation. J. Marr. Fam. 33(Nov.):658-663.

Wasserman, S.
1967 The Abused Parent of the Abused Child. Children 14(Sept-Oct.): 175-179.

Zalba, S.
1971 Battered Children. Transaction 8(July-Aug.):58-61.

Table 1. Relationships Between Child Maltreatment and Juvenile Contacts, By County, 1950 Sample*

	Maltreatment and JD and/or PINS	JD and/or PINS only	Total	
Broome	8.1%	2.0%	10.1%	(247)
St. Lawrence	15.2%	7.1%	22.3%	(99)
Suffolk	6.0%	2.7%	8.7%	(301)
Westchester	11.9%	7.5%	19.4%	(428)
Subtotal	9.7%	4.8%	14.5%	(1075)
Erie	21.0%	2.9%	23.9%	(1259)
Kings	18.3%	2.9%	21.2%	(618)
Monroe	28.0%	1.5%	29.5%	(528)
New York	13.4%	2.1%	15.5%	(821)
Subtotal	19.7%	2.5%	22.2%	(3226)
Total	17.2%	3.1%	20.3%	(4301)

*"Miscellaneous" contacts have been excluded.

Table 2. Relationships Between Child Maltreatment and Juvenile Contacts, By County, 1950 Sample*

	Maltreatment and Juvenile Contacts	Maltreatment and Juvenile Contacts for Those With at Least One Valid Maltreatment Contact
Broome	8.1% (247)	8.9% (191)
St. Lawrence	15.2% (99)	17.9% (84)
Suffolk	6.0% (301)	5.5% (182)
Westchester	11.9% (428)	10.5% (400)
Subtotal	9.7% (1075)	9.8% (857)
Erie	21.0% (1259)	21.5% (1168)
Kings	18.3% (618)	19.8% (531)
Monroe	28.0% (528)	28.2% (525)
New York	13.4% (821)	17.1% (556)
Subtotal	19.7% (3226)	21.5% (2780)
Total	17.2% (4301)	18.8% (3637)

*"Miscellaneous" contacts have been excluded.

Table 3. Migration Patterns
from 1950 - 1960
In the Eight New York Counties

	Total Population	Net Migration	Natural Increase
Broome	15.1%	-0.3%	15.4%
St. Lawrence	12.5%	-4.2%	16.7%
Suffolk	141.5%	116.6%	24.9%
Westchester	29.3%	17.3%	12.0%
Erie	18.4%	3.1%	15.3%
Kings	-4.0%	14.0%	9.9%
Monroe	20.3%	6.2%	14.1%
New York	-13.4%	-18.6%	5.2%

(Source: County and City Data Book, 1967, A Statistical Abstract Supplement, U. S. Department of Commerce.)

Table 4. Percent of Children Eligible for PINS/JD Contacts for Each County for Contacts 1 through 7
1950 Founded and Unfounded By Child Sample

County	Contact 1		Contact 2		Contact 3		Contact 4		Contact 5		Contact 6		Contact 7	
	% NA	% E	% NA	% E	% NA	% E	% NA	% E	% NA	% E	% NA	% E	% NA	% E
Broome (281)	5	42	67	39	78	38	92	46	95	29	98	14	98	0
St. Lawrence (101)	1	58	40	71	80	70	92	50	93	57	97	33	98	50
Suffolk (308)	4	46	67	63	90	66	97	80	99	100	100	-	100	-
Westchester (475)	3	40	70	72	88	71	94	82	97	33	98	40	99	17
Subtotal (1165)	3	44	66	62	85	58	94	66	97	40	98	30	99	15
Erie (1290)	17	30	33	46	52	61	69	73	81	80	89	83	93	81
Kings (625)	10	43	34	59	56	71	73	88	87	85	95	97	97	94
Monroe (545)	15	29	30	54	58	76	74	83	85	85	92	80	95	78
New York (838)	10	35	44	48	62	62	77	71	86	72	90	80	95	80
Subtotal (3298)	13	34	35	50	56	66	73	77	84	80	91	83	95	82
Total (4463)	11	37	43	52	64	65	78	76	87	77	93	80	96	77

Table 5. Missing Data on Available Background Characteristics, 1950 New York Sample of Children with Maltreatment Contacts.[a] (N=4463)

	N	Percent
Sex	7	.2%
Ethnicity	652	14.6
Mother's Birthplace	3	.1
Religion	4	.1
Born Out-of-Wedlock	36	.8
Mother Present in the Home	56	1.3
Father Present in the Home	80	1.8
Population per Household	NA[b]	NA

[a] This sample also included siblings with any type of official contacts - maltreatment or juvenile.

[b] As this variable includes parents, siblings and non-siblings who might be resident in a household, missing data is not distinguishable from the absence of a person in the household.

Table 6. Sex: Percent Males and Females

	In the General Population [a]		In the Total 1950 Sample		Among Children with Maltreatment Contacts and [b] JD Contacts		PINS Contacts	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Broome	49%	51%	50%	50% (280)	86%	14% (14)	56%	44% (9)
St. Lawrence	50	50	50	51 (101)	79	21 (14)	—	— (1)
Suffolk	50	50	51	49 (308)	89	11 (9)	44	56 (9)
Westchester	48	52	54	46 (474)	83	17 (30)	52	48 (27)
Subtotal	NA	NA	52	48 (1163)	84	16 (67)	52	48 (46)
Erie	49	51	54	46 (1286)	81	19 (167)	55	45 (148)
Kings	49	51	52	48 (624)	82	18 (67)	34	66 (59)
Monroe	48	52	51	50 (545)	69	31 (80)	44	56 (97)
New York	48	52	47	53 (838)	70	30 (54)	46	54 (65)
Subtotal	NA	NA	51	49 (3293)	77	23 (368)	47	53 (372)
Total	NA	NA	51	49 (4456)	78	22 (435)	48	52 (418)

[a] Taken from Tables prepared by Jose Alfaro (1977).

[b] As noted in the text, the two contact patterns presented here are not mutually exclusive.

Table 7. Ethnicity: Percent Non-White[a]

	In the General Population		In the Total 1950 Sample	Among Children with Maltreatment Contacts and	
	1950	1970		JD Contacts	PINS Contacts
Broome	.5%	1.4%	0% (112)	0% (12)	0% (6)
St. Lawrence	.2	.6	0 (101)	0 (14)	(1)
Suffolk	4.9	5.2	17 (266)	0 (8)	(14)
Westchester	6.2	10.2	34 (472)	27 (30)	41 (27)
Subtotal	NA	NA	22 (951)	13 (64)	29 (38)
Erie	4.8	9.6	18 (1006)	25 (146)	22 (125)
Kings	7.8	26.8	35 (615)	48 (67)	47 (58)
Monroe	1.7	7.9	16 (410)	38 (68)	17 (79)
New York	20.6	29.2	66 (829)	62 (52)	69 (67)
Subtotal	NA	NA	35 (2860)	38 (333)	34 (329)
Total	6.5	13.2	32 (3811)	34 (397)	34 (367)

[a] See footnotes to Table 2.

Table 8. Average Population Per Household[a]

	In the General Population, 1950	For the Total 1950 Sample Children	For 1950 Sample Children with Maltreatment Contacts and JD Contacts	For 1950 Sample Children with Maltreatment Contacts and PINS Contacts
oome	3.35	5.84 (281)	5.14 (14)	5.11 (9)
. Lawrence	3.63	9.02 (101)	8.36 (14)	- (1)
ffolk	3.31	5.29 (308)	4.78 (9)	6.67 (9)
stchester	3.40	5.08 (475)	5.30 (30)	6.48 (27)
btotal	NA	5.66 (1165)	5.84 (67)	6.50 (46)
ie	3.42	7.52 (1290)	7.81 (167)	8.17 (149)
ings	3.36	7.39 (625)	7.63 (67)	7.66 (59)
onroe	3.26	7.64 (545)	8.04 (80)	7.52 (97)
ew York	2.80	6.13 (838)	7.02 (54)	6.74 (68)
ubtotal	NA	7.16 (3298)	7.71 (368)	7.66 (373)
otal	NA	6.77 (4463)	7.42 (435)	7.53 (419)

[a] See footnotes to Table 2.

Table 9. Percent Born Out-of-Wedlock.

	In the General Population	In the Total 1950 Sample	Among Children with Maltreatment Contacts and	
			PINS Contacts	JD Contacts
Broome	3%	16% (274)	0% (9)	0% (14)
St. Lawrence	4	13 (101)	— (1)	21 (14)
Suffolk	2	12 (307)	11 (9)	0 (9)
Westchester	5	20 (471)	11 (27)	13 (30)
Subtotal	NA	16 (1153)	9 (46)	10 (67)
Erie	5	12 (1276)	9 (149)	14 (167)
Kings	8	19 (624)	14 (58)	10 (67)
Monroe	6	21 (539)	23 (96)	28 (79)
New York	18	27 (836)	43 (68)	24 (54)
Subtotal	NA	19 (3275)	20 (371)	18 (367)
Total	NA	18 (4428)	19 (417)	17 (434)

[a] See footnotes to Table 2.

Table 10. Parental Absence: The Percent of Mothers and of Fathers not Living with the Child.[a]

	In the Total 1950 Sample		Among Children with Maltreatment Contacts and PINS Contacts		Among Children with Maltreatment Contacts and JD Contacts	
	Mother Absent	Father Absent	Mother Absent	Father Absent	Mother Absent	Father Absent
Broome	37% (277)	51% (276)	44% (9)	38% (8)	43% (14)	57% (14)
St.Lawrence	26 (101)	17 (99)	— (1)	— (1)	0 (14)	50 (14)
Suffolk	12 (306)	47 (304)	0 (9)	78 (9)	11 (9)	33 (9)
Westchester	36 (463)	50 (463)	30 (27)	56 (27)	21 (29)	41 (29)
Subtotal	29 (1147)	47 (1142)	26 (46)	56 (45)	20 (66)	46 (66)
Erie	9 (1265)	31 (1258)	8 (147)	30 (146)	11 (163)	37 (162)
Kings	13 (624)	33 (623)	17 (59)	36 (59)	12 (67)	31 (67)
Monroe	4 (537)	42 (529)	3 (97)	44 (96)	4 (80)	45 (80)
New York	15 (834)	55 (831)	18 (68)	46 (67)	11 (54)	56 (54)
Subtotal	10 (3260)	39 (3241)	10 (371)	37 (368)	10 (364)	41 (363)
Total	15 (4407)	41 (4383)	12 (417)	39 (413)	11 (430)	41 (429)

[a] See footnotes to Table 2.

Table 11. Average Number of Years Between First and Last Contact of Any Type for Those 1950 Sample Children with Two or More Contacts*

	All 1950 Sample	Children with only Maltreatment Contacts	Children with Maltreatment and Juvenile Contacts	Children with only Juvenile Contacts
Broome	5.74 (85)	4.19 (61)	10.87 (17)	- (2)
St. Lawrence	4.58 (62)	3.09 (43)	7.27 (15)	- (4)
Suffolk	7.00 (101)	6.33 (77)	10.84 (18)	- (4)
Westchester	7.81 (138)	7.86 (244)	8.56 (51)	6.40 (19)
Subtotal	6.62 (386)	5.62 (244)	9.16 (101)	7.03 (29)
Erie	6.63 (905)	5.65 (651)	9.53 (227)	6.23 (23)
Kings	4.99 (420)	4.14 (294)	7.86 (107)	2.42 (11)
Monroe	9.08 (382)	7.76 (231)	11.29 (142)	7.28 (8)
New York	4.23 (463)	3.07 (356)	8.22 (97)	6.38 (9)
Subtotal	6.23 (2170)	5.08 (1532)	9.43 (573)	5.60 (51)
Total	6.29 (2556)	5.15 (1776)	9.39 (674)	6.12 (80)

*Based on eleven contacts (less than one percent had more than eleven contacts).

Table 12. Mean Number of Years Between First and Last Contact of any Type for Those 1950 Sample Children with Two or More Contacts

	Maltreatment Only		Interactions		Juvenile Only	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
roome	5.17 (31)	3.19 (30)	11.83 (11)	9.11 (6)	- (2)	- (0)
t. Lawrence	2.87 (23)	3.35 (20)	7.96 (12)	- (3)	- (2)	- (2)
uffolk	6.05 (41)	6.64 (36)	10.34 (12)	11.83 (6)	- (4)	- (0)
estchester	8.46 (31)	7.28 (32)	7.78 (34)	10.13 (17)	6.30 (14)	6.68 (5)
Subtotal	5.85 (126)	5.38 (118)	8.90 (69)	9.73 (32)	7.16 (22)	6.64 (7)
rie	5.36 (315)	5.93 (334)	8.88 (152)	10.80 (74)	6.90 (17)	4.32 (6)
ings	4.28 (144)	4.01 (150)	8.31 (63)	7.22 (44)	3.10 (6)	1.60 (5)
onroe	7.39 (102)	8.05 (129)	11.65 (80)	10.82 (62)	7.24 (5)	- (3)
ew York	2.87 (159)	3.24 (197)	8.19 (53)	8.25 (44)	2.83 (5)	- (4)
Subtotal	4.88 (720)	5.26 (810)	9.31 (348)	9.60 (224)	5.64 (33)	5.51 (18)
otal	5.03 (846)	5.27 (928)	9.24 (417)	9.62 (256)	6.25 (55)	5.83 (25)

Table 13. Mean Number of Years Between First and Last Contact of any Type for Those 1950 Sample Children with Two or More COntacts

	Maltreatment Only		Interactions		Juvenile Only	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Broome	3.90 (36)	- (0)	9.78 (13)	- (0)	- (2)	- (0)
St. Lawrence	3.09 (43)	- (0)	7.27 (15)	- (0)	- (5)	- (0)
Suffolk	5.17 (51)	7.49 (19)	10.19 (12)	- (0)	- (2)	- (0)
Westchester	7.40 (50)	9.70 (12)	7.54 (33)	11.13 (16)	7.60 (7)	5.70 (12)
Subtotal	5.04 (180)	8.35 (31)	8.32 (73)	11.13 (16)	8.78 (15)	5.70 (12)
Erie	5.54 (421)	4.22 (66)	9.13 (150)	10.49 (41)	7.40 (13)	- (3)
Kings	4.20 (201)	3.68 (77)	8.16 (59)	7.78 (37)	3.44 (5)	9.42 (6)
Monroe	7.77 (148)	7.83 (27)	11.31 (87)	11.37 (28)	- (3)	- (3)
New York	2.82 (121)	3.37 (147)	6.73 (35)	9.67 (49)	- (1)	7.47 (7)
Subtotal	5.24 (891)	4.00 (317)	9.28 (331)	9.74 (155)	5.88 (22)	6.29 (19)
Total	5.21 (1071)	4.39 (348)	9.11 (404)	9.87 (171)	7.06 (37)	6.06 (31)

SECTION TWO

FAMILY COMPOSITION AND ITS RELATION TO CHILD MALTREATMENT AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY*

ANDRÉA CARR RICHARD J. GELLES EILEEN F. HARGREAVES

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

*A paper presented at the Third Annual Conference on Child Abuse and Neglect, April 17, 1978. This paper is part of a research program on intrafamily violence supported by grants from the National Institute of Mental Health (MH27557) and the National Center of Child Abuse and Neglect/Office of Child Development 90-C-425.

FAMILY COMPOSITION AND ITS RELATION TO CHILD MALTREATMENT AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Sociologists and criminologists have long attempted to unravel the "causes" of delinquency (Glueck and Glueck, 1950; Hirschi and Selvin, 1967; Nye, 1958). Much of the delinquency research assumed that child maltreatment was linked to becoming a delinquent. This link was demonstrated when investigators presented the relationship between various types of family composition believed to be harmful to children (e.g. single parent family) and the later involvement of children from these families in delinquent behavior (Chilton, 1972). One problem with this research was that child maltreatment was never measured as a distinct variable, rather it was assumed that children from certain families were maltreated by virtue of the presumed harmful context of the family structure.

This paper examines the relationship between family structure, child maltreatment, and juvenile delinquency. Rather than assuming that certain structures result in maltreatment, we use a direct measure of the maltreatment of children. An examination of official reports of child maltreatment[1] for children in eight counties in New York state was used to determine whether children in certain family contexts were maltreated (at least we know whether they came to public attention for suspected maltreatment incidents). The records of official agencies were also examined to determine whether the children who were reported as maltreated had contact with official agencies later in their lives for suspected juvenile delinquency.[2] We also have information on whether children had later agency contacts for "status

offenses."

Investigators have already demonstrated that there is a relationship between being maltreated or abused and later becoming a juvenile delinquent (Alfaro, 1978; Jenkins, 1974; Chilton, 1972). Our investigation examined various types of family environment and whether certain types of family situations are associated with children having contact with official agencies for maltreatment and then later for juvenile delinquency. Our search is for types of family structure which increase the likelihood that a child will be officially labeled a "maltreated child" and then later in life be officially labeled a "delinquent."

The examination of family composition factors which are related to our two dependent variables (maltreatment and delinquency) was limited by the fact that we were conducting a secondary analysis of data gathered from official reports of maltreatment and delinquency (see following section on methods of procedure). However, some of the important characteristics of families which have been proposed as related to delinquency and child abuse were available in the data. Specifically, we had data on the presence or absence of the parents, the number of children in the family, the presence of others in the household, and whether the child was born in or out of wedlock. We used these items as our independent variables and we suggest that they can also be used as indicators of the degree of tension or stress in families.

The specific hypotheses were:

1. The absence of a parent increases the likelihood of being in

contact with the official system for maltreatment and delinquency;

2. The number of children in the family is positively related to being officially labeled a maltreated-delinquent;
3. The presence of a relative in the household is related (direction unspecified) to the likelihood of having official contact for maltreatment and delinquency;
4. The presence of a paramour in the household is positively related to being an official maltreated-delinquent;
5. Being born out of wedlock is positively related to being officially labeled a maltreated-delinquent.

Previous research has frequently proposed that broken homes are associated with both child abuse and delinquency. Single parents may have greater difficulty coping with their children and thus, be more prone to abusing or neglecting the children (Gil, 1970; Johnson, 1974). Research on juvenile delinquency finds that single parenthood may contribute to delinquency by reducing the level of supervision which controls the actions of children (Glueck and Glueck, 1950). It does not automatically follow that the absence of one or both parents will be related to both maltreatment and delinquency. Maltreated children may be institutionalized during their teenage years and thus have a decreased chance of having official contacts for delinquency.

Size of family tends to be related to abuse, although the relationship is not a linear one (Gil, 1970; Straus and Gelles, 1978). It is not clear whether large families have more abuse because their size causes stress or whether size reduces resources (and therefore produces stress). Nevertheless,

we predict that there will be a positive relationship between family size and the chances of a child being maltreated and becoming delinquent.

The presence of non-nuclear family members may also be associated with maltreatment and delinquency. Non-nuclear family members may preclude the occurrence of maltreatment and delinquency for a variety of reasons. Gelles (1974) found that families with non-nuclear family members residing permanently in the household had a lower than predicted rate of husband to wife violence. Violence seemed to be prevented by the non-nuclear family member through a number of mechanisms. First, the extra person may be a resource--another wage earner, babysitter, or cook. Secondly, the non-nuclear family member could serve as a "referee" in family conflict and bring about non-violent resolution to conflicts. However, it could be that the non-nuclear family member could add stress to a household. An extra person may put more pressure on family resources, compete for scarce resources (like bathrooms and televisions), and vie with the parents for the attention of the children.

We predict that if the non-nuclear family member is a paramour, this would further increase the risk of maltreatment and delinquency. First, this type of arrangement is considered deviant by a large portion of society (in many jurisdictions it would be considered illegal). This unusual family situation could have two outcomes. The family may be more visible to agents of social control and this may bring maltreatment and delinquency to public attention more readily. Second, this deviant arrangement may lead to the acceptance of unconventional patterns within the family, thus reducing pressure to conform to social expectations about parenting and acceptable

juvenile behavior.

Research on juvenile delinquency rarely considers if the child was born out of wedlock. However, research on child abuse has often shown that children conceived and/or born out of wedlock are prone to being maltreated (Zalba, 1971; Bennie and Sclare, 1969; and Wasserman, 1967). Our question is whether a child born out of wedlock runs a risk of being maltreated and becoming delinquent.

Our independent variables, single parent households, large families, presence of a paramour, and out of wedlock childbirth, all can be considered stressful family contexts. Thus, while we are testing the direct relationships between each of our independent variables with our two dependent variables, we are also testing to see whether maltreatment and delinquency are the products of stressful family situations.

The Relationship Between Maltreatment and Delinquency

There are three main explanations for why child maltreatment may lead to later juvenile delinquency. First, certain family environments may increase the risk of a child being maltreated and the experience with maltreatment leads the child to adopt delinquent modes of behavior as a juvenile. Second, the family environments which society views as deviant or harmful potentially increase the likelihood of a family having official maltreatment contacts. The experience with the system, in turn, may enhance the likelihood of the same family having a later contact for juvenile misconduct. Thirdly, it is also possible that certain family characteristics make certain families visible and, thus, more likely to be labeled as maltreaters. Once the family

is visible to official agencies, this may increase the chances that abberant behavior of a child be officially defined as delinquent.

The data set which we examined does not allow us to actually test the validity of the third claim. We can, however, test for either the first or second propositions. If the first propostion is accurate, then the relationship between the family factors and maltreated-delinquent children should be stronger for those cases of maltreatment which were judged "valid." If the different types of family composition have an equal effect on the relationship between maltreatment and juvenile offenses, then we would think that the second proposition is more credible.

METHODS OF PROCEDURE

This investigation examines data collected in eight counties in the state of New York. Two separate samples of children were drawn.[3] First, children who had contact with official agencies for agency defined "child maltreatment" in the early 1950s were identified and traced through county records (forward and backward in time), for any other agency contacts (whether for maltreatment or for juvenile offenses). These children constitute what we refer to as the 1950 sample, and they were followed forward for twenty years, so that even the youngest child in the sample would have become 18 (and thus, ineligible for being classified a juvenile delinquent) by the last year agency records were examined. A second sample of children who had juvenile contacts in the early 1970s was traced backward in county records to determine if they had any earlier contacts for delinquency and

maltreatment.

The 1950 sample was selected because the children were officially reported as maltreated while the 1970 sample was selected because the children had an official juvenile delinquency contact. Both samples were examined over twenty year periods.

The central advantage of these data is that they represent a longitudinal study of child maltreatment and juvenile delinquency. The data do not suffer from the usual drawbacks of faulty recall among a sample of delinquents or their parents who are asked to reconstruct the juvenile's childhood for a questionnaire or in an interview. A second major advantage of these data is that they were drawn using a non-reactive measurement procedure (Webb, et al., 1966). As we will discuss in the next few paragraphs, official records do have major problems, but one chief advantage is that using official records provides a non-reactive measure of the key variables under investigation.

The first, and most obvious problem inherent in using official records is that the records do not represent the total number of children who are maltreated or who are delinquent. Official records are subject to a variety of biases in their compilation and they represent only a portion of the total number of maltreated and delinquent children. Because we are using official records we have to rely on the official agency definitions of maltreatment and delinquency. These definitions change over time and are applied differently depending on the characteristics of the person doing the labeling and the person being labeled.

There are futher limitations in our data. Official records can be

destroyed. Also, families move, and thus, we are analyzing children who have contacts for maltreatment and delinquency in one county. If a family moved after an act of maltreatment or delinquency was recorded we could not follow them, given the way cases were sampled in the study.

Because the data come from only 8 counties in New York state, our findings are not generalizable to any larger population. They can, however, be used to suggest further research with more representative samples.

Characteristics of the Samples

There are several differences in the two samples. In the 1950 sample all siblings of the children reported for maltreatment in the sample year were included if they had at least one official contact. In the 1970 sample, siblings were included only if they too had juvenile offense contacts in the sample year.

Some characteristics of the two samples are, by design and definition, different. Boys are highly over-represented in the 1970 sample, while the 1950 maltreatment sample has an equal representation of boys and girls. The mean age of the children at the time of their first agency contact is different: the 1970 sample was, on the average, 7 years older than the 1950 sample at the time of first agency contact. Lastly, while Blacks are disproportionately represented in both samples (compared to their representation in the general population of the counties), they are much more disproportionately represented in the 1970 sample. This is probably due to the migration of Blacks to northern cities in the 1950s and 1960s.

Measurement of Family Characteristics

The family characteristic variables were measured at the time of the sample year contact (which may not be the first contact the child had) for the 1950 sample. For the 1970 sample, family composition variables were measured at the time of the sample year contact for delinquency.

Maltreatment and Delinquency

We classified a child as maltreated and having a juvenile offense by identifying the first contact and the reason for the contact (referral reason).[4] If, in subsequent contacts with agencies, there was at least one contact for which the first referral reason was delinquency or a status offense,[5] then we considered that child as having both maltreatment and delinquency contacts.

Our dependent variable, then, is whether a child has, at first agency contact, a primary referral reason for maltreatment and, in a subsequent agency contact, a first referral reason for a juvenile offense. This procedure was used for both samples.[6]

Maltreatment and Abuse

Because child maltreatment is a general, if not almost undefinable concept, we have chosen to separate physical abuse from the general concept of maltreatment in our examination of the relation of certain family characteristics with maltreatment and juvenile offenses. Thus, we examine children who have a combination of contacts for maltreatment and delinquency and children who had abuse and delinquency contacts. (See Table 1 for distribution

of maltreatment and abuse for both samples).

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MALTREATMENT AND JUVENILE OFFENSES

If maltreatment were unrelated to juvenile delinquency, then the children in the 1950 sample should show one or more contacts for maltreatment, and very few (if any) contacts for juvenile offenses. In other words, the rate of later juvenile contact for the maltreatment sample should be the same as the rate of juvenile contact for the general population. Similarly, the 1970 sample children should not show a large number of contacts for maltreatment (they should have the same rate of contact as non-delinquent children). This is not the case. Alfaro (1978) has already examined the 1950 and 1970 sample data and found a relationship between maltreatment and later delinquency. For the 1950 sample and their siblings, nearly 20 percent had later contact for juvenile offenses. In the 1970 sample, more than 20 percent had earlier contact for maltreatment.

FINDINGS -- THE EFFECTS OF FAMILY COMPOSITION

Nuclear Family Composition

In Table 2 we examine the impact of two family composition variables -- parental presence in the home and family size on our dependent variables. Interestingly, abused-delinquents are more prevalent when both parents are present in the home, especially in the 1950 sample of maltreated children.

When the mother alone is present, the percent of maltreated-delinquents is highest, especially in the 1970 sample. The older average age of the children at first contact in the 1970 sample may partially explain this finding. It may be that these are more established families or families where there has been more time for the wife to be deserted, divorced, or left by her husband. And, indeed, there are more "mother-only" families in the 1970 sample.[7] The 1950 sample appears to consist of younger families which, while still intact, may have had a difficult time rearing their children, and resorted to physical violence, while among the "older" families of the 1970 sample more general neglect brought on by the life style of mothers without husbands may be more common.

Family size is clearly related to being a maltreated-delinquent. Twenty-eight percent of the 1970 sample children who come from families with eight or more children were official maltreated-delinquents, while 21 percent of the 1950 sample were. This relationship appears stronger in the 1970 sample where desired family size is more likely to have been achieved.[8] In both samples, there also appears to be a relationship between family size and being an abused-delinquent. In both samples, more than three times as many children living in the largest families were abused and later had juvenile offense contacts.

Potentially Stressful Family Settings

Persons, other than nuclear family members, may produce stress in families. We noted above that the presence of relatives can, logically, be either an extended family resource, or again, can be a source of meddling, nagging and a general drain on family resources.

The presence of a paramour seems clearly to be a stressful family situation, particularly for older children.

Lastly, being born out of wedlock is likely to reflect, at least temporarily, instability in the family. The effects of these three family structures on the maltreatment-juvenile misconduct relationship are presented in Table 3.

The presence of a relative in the household is not related to children being either abused- or maltreated-delinquents. This does not rule out the possibility that a relative's presence has impact, for the relatives who are resources may be present as often as are relatives who are sources of stress. We cannot test these alternative hypotheses, at present.

The presence of a paramour has clear impact on the likelihood of a child being maltreated and then becoming delinquent. Thirty-seven percent of the 1970 sample children who live in households with a paramour present are maltreated-delinquents. As predicted, the relationship is stronger among the "older" 1970 sample children. And, it is interesting that the presence of a paramour does not seem to be related to being abused as a child and growing up to be delinquent. Perhaps, among the children who act on their hostility at this particular family situation, it is the older children who's actions more often bring them to the attention of the official system.

Children born out of wedlock are not, in these data, more likely to be abused-delinquents. If anything, children born <u>in</u> wedlock are more likely to be abused-delinquents. Only among the 1970 sample children are those born out of wedlock more likely to be maltreated-delinquents. The apparently

stronger affect of in-wedlock birth, among the 1950 sample children, suggests that "younger" parents who marry "for the sake of the child" may only be subjecting themselves to severe strain that often results in physical abuse and later delinquency. We would, then, expect this relationship to be high when the mother and father are present and the child is not born out of wedlock.

Combination Family Structures

In Table 4, we present: (a) the combination of parental presence and the wedlock status of the parents at the time of the child's birth, and (b) the combination of families of varying sizes where only the mother is present.

The percentage of abused-delinquents is highest when both parents are present, the child is not born out of wedlock; and especially among the younger 1950 sample children. This, too, is consistent with the argument, suggested above, that premature marriage for the child's sake may, in reality, create great stress. That stress may lead to physical abuse and later delinquency by the child. Among the older 1970 sample children, the child who was born out of wedlock and lives with only the mother is most likely to be a maltreated-delinquent (36 percent). Perhaps, in the older 1970 sample, the mother felt deserted (by having a child out of wedlock), and still being alone, feels a greater or growing resentment leading to neglect. The neglected child, in turn, acts out. Consistent with this argument is the relatively low percent (16%) of children in the 1970 sample who are maltreated-delinquents and who were born out-of-wedlock, but had two parents present at the time of first official contact.

Finally, mothers without husbands or without other adults living in their household are likely to be under stress in raising their children. And, the greater the number of children, the greater that stress is likely to be. Both the 1950 and 1970 sample children are more likely to be maltreated-delinquents if they come from large families with only the mother present. In the 1970 sample fully 46 percent of children with this family situation are maltreated-delinquents. The respective percent for the 1950 sample is 22 percent. It is not clear why the relationship appears stronger in the 1970 sample, but perhaps it is because in these families, being older, the situation of the mother alone with a large family is more reflective of the "stabilized" family situation, whereas in the 1950 sample, where family size and parental presence are measured at a time when the children are younger, the families have not yet been "completed." That is to say, in the 1950 sample some children falling into intermediate family size categories might, had these variables been measured when the children were slightly older, indeed, be in the "female-headed, eight or more children" category. This would artificially dilute the impact of this variable in the 1950 sample.

To summarize, presence of both mother and father, large numbers of siblings and particularly the combination of both parents and a child born in wedlock tend to be associated with being an officially abused-delinquent. On the other hand, children born out of wedlock, in large families, without fathers present, but living with their mothers and a paramour, (at least among the 1970 sample children) are more likely to become officially maltreated-delinquents.

Family Composition and Sex

The disproportionate number of boys in the 1970 sample suggests the necessity of controlling for sex. Some of our findings could be a result of, or obscured by, this over-representation of boys. In Tables 5 through 7, we present the family composition variables separately for boys and girls. Nearly all the findings reported above hold equally for boys and for girls. We discuss only the exceptions.

The finding that being born in wedlock, with both parents present at the time of first contact in the 1950 sample is associated with being an abused-delinquent is largely due to this association being present for boys. This result is not surprising, as much child abuse research has reported that boys are more likely to be physically abused than are girls. Gelles (1977), in a study of "intact" families finds this and here we too, find boys are officially abused-delinquents more often than girls if they are born in wedlock and both parents are present. Perhaps, our failure to find this more generally is a function of our sample design, where, by using official statistics, we may be inadvertently including a greater number of "unusual" family types in our sample.

The other notable difference between boys and girls is seen in Table 6. The presence of a paramour greatly increases the likelihood of being a maltreated-delinquent for boys, and less so for girls. As it is likely that in many cases the paramour is the mother's boyfriend rather than the father's girlfriend, and as this effect is most pronounced in the 1970 sample where the children are, on the average, older at first contact, the result is not surprising. The stress created for a somewhat older boy if his mother has a

boyfriend living with the family must be quite great, and whether the rivalry so created causes intentional maltreatment and thereby acting out on the part of the child, or whether the mother's increasing interest in and time commitment to the boyfriend leads to neglect, or perceived neglect, the resulting juvenile misconduct seems a likely outcome of this volatile situation.

Family Composition and Race

The over-representation of Blacks is greater in the 1970 sample than in the 1950 sample. This, in turn, leads to an expectation that there will be an over-representation in the 1970 sample of certain family characteristics believed to be more prevalent among Blacks--particularly larger families and more female-headed families. Thus, Tables 8 through 10 present the same data as in Tables 2 through 4, but separately for whites and Blacks. As in our discussions of sex, we will present all the tables, but only note the important differences between Blacks and whites.

The presence of both parents is associated with being an abused-delinquent in the 1950 sample. But, for Blacks the relationship exists in both samples and appears stronger. And, the somewhat contrary finding that the presence of the mother alone increases the percentage of maltreated-delinquents is only significant for whites in the 1970 sample. These two findings, taken together, suggest that the intact family, probably a less frequent situation for Blacks than whites, is the exact family situation that most exposes Black children to physical danger and, perhaps in turn, leads Black children to engage in conduct society deems inappropriate. Indeed, in the 1950 sample,

61 percent of the white families are "intact" as opposed to 42 percent of the Black families. In the 1970 sample this proportion is slightly more pronounced -- 59 percent of white families are "intact" as are 36 percent of the Black families. Perhaps, Blacks are better able to deal with the situation of a mother alone raising children, than are whites. Or, perhaps, the system is more likely to officially label a Black for maltreatment (physical or otherwise) and for juvenile offenses if the child comes from such an "abnormal" family situation. The absense of a related, non-sibling in the households of Blacks in the 1950 sample is associated with being a maltreated-delinquent. This is the only instance in which the presence or absence of a relative has been shown to have any effect. It is possible that for Blacks, where mothers often raise children without the father present, relatives are indeed a resource which can alleviate or minimize the stresses and strains of such a situation.

On the other hand, the presence of a paramour in the household, previously demonstrated to be a stressful situation, increases the percentage of maltreated-delinquents in the 1970 sample (Table 9) and has a significantly greater impact on whites than on Blacks (the numbers, especially for whites, are admittedly small, but the chi square indicates that the relationship found is not likely to have occurred by chance). It may be that this, too, is a situation more common to Blacks and to which they have better adapted than have whites. Still, in the 1950 sample, the effect of the presence of a paramour on Blacks seems more important. While these results are equivocal, there is reason to suggest that blacks cope better, in terms of their children less frequently being maltreated-delinquents when they are

in family environments that appear to promote such status.

For Blacks, but not for whites, there is significant relationship between being born out of wedlock and being a maltreated-delinquent, in the 1970 sample. This finding is somewhat inconsistent with the line of reasoning we have been developing about the adaptability of Blacks to unusual family situations, but it only occurs in this one sample. Still, it is clear that it is a more usual family situation, in the 1970 sample, for Blacks (6 percent of the whites and 22 percent of the Blacks in the 1970 sample were born out of wedlock). Thus, we have some evidence that the argument we are developing is not flawless.

There is a consistent tendency, although not significant, for being born <u>in</u> wedlock to be related to being an abused-delinquent. And, this is seen for both Blacks and whites to about the same degree.

In the 1970 sample (older families) there is, for both Blacks and for whites, an association between being born <u>out</u> of wedlock with only the mother present and maltreatment and juvenile contacts. Thirty-eight percent of the whites and thirty-six percent of Blacks with this family situation are maltreated-delinquents. And, apparently this association is stronger for whites. For Blacks, being born <u>in</u> wedlock with both parents present, in the 1950 sample, is associated with being an abused-delinquent. The association also appears to hold for whites, but not at a level of statistical significance. Here again, we see, particularly for blacks, the anomoly that the "normal" family situation tends to lead to multiple contacts with the official system, particularly in the younger 1950 sample, and involving physical abuse.

The final data presented in Table 10 suggest, again, that our argument

that Blacks develop better mechanisms to deal with "unusual" family situations than do whites may have some merit. In the 1950 sample it is white families with many children and the mother alone which have a large percentage of children who are maltreated-delinquents (27 percent, as opposed to 18 percent of Blacks -- about the average for all Blacks who live with their mothers alone). In the 1970 sample both Blacks and whites are more likely to be maltreated-delinquents if they come from large, female-headed families (68 percent of the white children, again based on small numbers of children, and 44 percent of the Black children in this type of family have both contacts). Overall, then, Blacks appear better able to cope with large female-headed families. Or Blacks living in such stressful situations are at least less likely to come to the attention of authorities for both maltreatment and for juvenile offenses.

Summary

So far, our findings indicate that indeed, some family structures appear to be associated with official contact with the system for both maltreatment (in some cases, particularly for physical abuse) and for juvenile misconduct. The most frequently demonstrated associations in these data are that:

1. being born in wedlock appears to be associated with being an abused-delinquent;
2. the presence of a paramour in the home is associated with being a maltreated-delinquent;
3. in the 1970 sample, the presence of the mother only with a child born out of wedlock is associated with being a maltreated-delinquent,

while the presence of both parents with a child born in wedlock appears to be associated with being an abused-delinquent;

4. a child from a large, female-headed family is more likely to be a maltreated-delinquent.

And, the above associations tend to hold for both sexes, and for both blacks and whites, although for whites to a greater degree in several cases.

These findings are for all children reported to county agencies in eight counties in New York. Some of these children are not maltreated, but are only reported as maltreated. While several interpretations of the data so far presented are possible, we can explore one set of alternative interpretations further. If family structure is actually related to maltreatment and delinquency, then the associations should only be present for cases that, on investigation are found to be actual maltreatment cases, and not for those cases falsely reported to official agencies. Thus, controlling for the "validity" of the maltreatment will allow us to further investigate the associations we have found. As we are not implying that maltreatment leads to delinquency, that contact for maltreatment leads to delinquency, or that contact for maltreatment leads to contact for delinquency (we are leaving these three alternative interpretations for later analysis) we need not be concerned with the "validity" of the juvenile contact. And, the cases of maltreatment that are unfounded, comprising about 20 percent of these samples, we should caution, are "invalid" cases of maltreatment because of the interpretation of the situation by agents of the official systems dealing with the problem of child maltreatment. These agents know, at the time of disposition of a particular case, much about the family characteristics we

are examining. It is, therefore, possible that in determining the finding in any given case, family characteristics weigh heavily in the decision, thereby confounding the relationship between family composition and contact patterns with official agencies to an unknown degree.

Founded and Unfounded Cases

Tables 11 through 14 present the association between the family composition variables we have found to be most clearly associated with patterns of either physical abuse or maltreatment and later juvenile misconduct. We have restricted the data presented to the 1950 sample.[9] Specifically, we present data on the presence or absence of a paramour, in or out of wedlock birth combined with parental presence or absence, and female-headed families of varying sizes. This is done for both founded and unfounded maltreatment cases, and also for both Blacks and whites. Although presenting this data, we will only briefly summarize the findings.

Essentially, these tables show that only among founded cases do the previously demonstrated relationships between family composition and contact patterns stand up. Among unfounded cases, the relationships of family background to maltreatment and juvenile contacts is greatly diminished or nonexistent (Tables 11 and 12). The consistency of this finding suggests that it is not the experience of being in contact with official agencies that leads to later delinquency, but rather that it is the experience of being maltreated (or abused) that leads to later delinquent activity.

Tables 13 and 14 suggest that the above finding holds for both Blacks and whites. Blacks are not more likely to be in contact with the system for

both types of contacts because of any particular family composition that many would believe to be "harmful." And, Blacks, at least in the 1950 sample, are actually slightly less likely to have the first maltreatment contact found valid.

This final set of tables also reveals that among the unfounded maltreatment cases, it is those children living in homes with a paramour present who are more likely to later have an official juvenile contact. Children born out of wedlock are more likely to have a subsequent juvenile contact (the reverse of the results seen among founded maltreatment cases). And, these findings are the same for Blacks and whites (Table 13).

It appears that among unfounded maltreatment cases, it is those children living in family situations that are often believed by many to be "abnormal" who later are again in contact with official agencies for juvenile offenses. That is, among the unfounded maltreatment cases, the maltreatment-delinquency relationship is greatest in those family situations where "common sense" would predict it to be high. This suggests that reporters of maltreatment may very well report cases on the basis of what they consider abnormal family situations. On the other hand, the associations present among founded maltreatment cases suggest that agents charged with the responsibility of determining the validity of a case are relatively uninfluenced by the presence of family situations generally viewed as "abnormal."

Our results, when controlling for case validity, reveal that the associations demonstrated earlier between family composition and the likelihood of a child having a maltreatment contact and a later juvenile contact continue to exist among founded maltreatment cases. These associations between family

background and contact patterns for maltreatment and juvenile offenses, then, do not appear to be a result of having once been in contact with the official system. Rather, it appears that certain family structures, indeed, increase the likelihood of maltreatment and, later, contact for juvenile misconduct.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

We have selected a rather unusual dependent variable to examine in this paper. Rather than look at the family characteristics which are associated with either child abuse or juvenile delinquency, we chose to analyze factors related to a child being reported as both a maltreated child and as a juvenile delinquent.

The major question we sought to answer was, given that there is a growing body of evidence that maltreatment is related to later becoming delinquent, and that there are some family characteristics which are presumed to be associated with maltreatment and also related to delinquency, are there identifiable family characterisitcs which are associated with being both maltreated and delinquent?

We hypothesized that the absence of a parent would be related to being maltreated and becoming delinquent. Our findings show that children who lived with both parents at the time they were abused were most likely to become delinquents. Mother-only families had the highest percentage of children who were maltreated and then were delinquent.

Our second hypothesis was that children from larger families would be

most likely to be maltreated and then go on to be officially labeled delinquents. This was indeed the case. The largest families did have the highest proportions of children who had been maltreated and were delinquent.

We also posited that the presence of a non-nuclear family relative would be related to being maltreated and being delinquent. This hypothesis was not supported in our analysis.

Presence of a paramour was found related to being maltreated and becoming delinquent.

Although the research in child abuse argues that children born out of wedlock are likely to be abused, we found that being born out of wedlock did not influence the likelihood of a child being maltreated and becoming delinquent. In fact, being born in wedlock was related to being an abused child who grows up to become delinquent.

When we looked at combinations of family structures we found that the families where the children were most likely to have agency contacts for abuse and then later contacts for delinquency were large, female-headed families.

One question, which concerned us, was whether the relations we found were due to the fact that we were dealing with official reports. We thought that the relationships might be due to the fact that certain types of family structures (female-headed, large families, children born out of wedlock, or paramour living in the home) are considered deviant by the majority of society, and these families may be more visible, thus increasing the likelihood that they would be identified for deviant acts of the parents (maltreatment of children) and deviant acts of the children (delinquency).

When we controlled for whether or not the initial contact for maltreatment resulted in a confirmation that the child was in fact maltreated, we found that the relationships held only for instances where the agency in contact with the family found that maltreatment report valid. Thus, it appears that the family characteristics associated with being maltreated and later becoming delinquent are not due to the high visibility of the families, but rather to some mechanism which occurs in the family which increases the risk of official contacts for delinquency after the child is maltreated.

We attempted to determine if the family characteristics which were present when the child was maltreated are still likely to be present when the child has a contact for delinquency. Although the 1950 and 1970 samples are different children[10] we can compare the family situations of maltreated-delinquents in 1950 with the situation in 1970. When we do this we find that:

1. Fathers are likely to be absent in families of maltreated-delinquents when they have contact for maltreatment (1950) and when they have contact for delinquency (1970).
2. Maltreated-delinquents come from large families when they have contact for maltreatment or abuse (the 1950 sample) and the families are also large among maltreated-delinquents who have contact for delinquency (the 1970 sample).
3. Paramours are more likely to be present in the homes of maltreated-delinquents at the time of maltreatment and at the time of delinquency.

Thus, we can infer (even though we did not follow the same families

over time and record family structure in 1950 and 1970) that certain family structures that raise the risk of children being maltreated and becoming delinquent persist over time.

Ideally, in order to adequately test the theory that these family structures are consistently associated with maltreatment and delinquency, we should follow the same cohort over time and analyze the impact of family structural change on the likelihood of a maltreated child growing up and becoming delinquent. We would like to see what happens if a paramour leaves the home after the maltreatment, or if the mother remarries, etc.

CONCLUSION

The study of child abuse and child maltreatment is relatively new (especially among social scientists). It is only in the last three years that we have had even preliminary data which argue that abused and neglected children are likely to become delinquent. Our analysis of the factors associated with being maltreated and being delinquent breaks new ground in that we try to identify factors associated with being maltreated and growing up to be delinquent. However, we are far short of our ultimate goal of explaining the mechanisms which raise the risk of a maltreated child becoming delinquent. The analysis of the founded and unfounded reports of maltreatment lead us to believe that the relationship between maltreatment and delinquency is not a function of certain types of families being susceptable to being labeled for deviant acts. Our analysis suggests that certain types of family environments are condusive to children being maltreated

and becoming delinquent. The task of researchers now is to identify the mechanisms which produce this relationship.

FOOTNOTES

[1]While much controversy exists about appropriate definitions of child abuse and child neglect, we are using the behaviors most often officially defined, in New York, as child maltreatment. And, we have chosen, in most cases in this paper, to use the more general term "child maltreatment," unless the form of maltreatment is clearly physical abuse of the child, or the serious risk thereof.

[2]Similarly to our use of the term "child maltreatment" we are measuring delinquency by using official definitions, and we will use the general term delinquency, or juvenile misconduct to represent the more specific behaviors that, at least in New York, are called juvenile delinquency.

[3]For a more detailed discussion of the sampling procedures, see Alfaro, 1978.

[4]In the New York county records, agency workers write in the actual behaviors for which a child becomes involved with various agencies. In the data collection process over 50 separate "referral reasons" were coded, some of these being behaviors that are defined by officials as maltreatment. Those "defined" as maltreatment are specified in Appendix A. The first three maltreatment reasons listed in Appendix A are those we have used as a measure of physical abuse.

[5]The behaviors that are, by New York "definitions," delinquency or status offenses may also be found in Appendix A.

[6]It would, of course, be better to include all contacts for earlier maltreatment, and to include all referral reasons for any given contact. However, the contact patterns become infinite and time precludes our resolving this. Further, this procedure seems reasonable as over a third of each sample had only one contact (36 percent of the 1970 sample and 43 percent of the 1950 sample). In fact only 41 percent of the 1970 sample and 36 percent of the 1950 sample had three or more contacts.

[7]It is also possible that the greater preponderance of Black families in the 1970 sample may contribute to the larger number of "female-headed" families in this sample.

[8]By virtue of the average age at first contact of the children in the 1970 sample, it is likely that these families are closer to being "completed."

[9]The larger sample size in the 1950 maltreated sample permits us to control for "validity."

[10] The sampling procedure, drawing on county records for a twenty year period, means that some children included in this 1950 sample may also be included in the 1970 sample -- children who had official contacts in the same county for both maltreatment and delinquency. However, we cannot be certain which children in the two samples are the same.

TABLE 1

MALTREATMENT, ABUSE AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY CONTACTS
THE 1950 AND 1970 SAMPLES

	Percent with a First Contact for Physical Abuse And at Least One Later Juvenile Contact	Percent with a First Contact for Maltreatment And at least One Later Juvenile Contact
1950 Sample: Maltreated Children and siblings (N=4463)	1.3%	14.9%
1970 Sample: Juvenile Offenders (N=1965)	2.4%	13.5%

Table 2. Contact Patterns by Parental Presence and Family Size: A Comparison of the 1950 and 1970 Samples

Family Composition Variables	1950 Sample N	1950 Sample Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	1950 Sample Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts	1970 Sample N	1970 Sample Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	1970 Sample Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts
Parental Presence						
Both parents present	2225	2.1%	15.4%	533	3.8%	12.9%
Father only present	348	0.0	12.9	63	3.2	20.6
Mother only present	1483	.9	16.0	488	3.3	25.0
		sig.=.0007	sig.=.3499		sig.=.9091	sig.=.0000
Number of children in the family						
one child	298	.7%	8.4%	414	.7%	3.9%
2-4 children	1876	1.1	12.5	727	2.5	11.8
5-7 children	1364	1.2	15.3	599	3.3	17.0
8 or more children	925	2.3	21.1	225	2.7	27.6
		sig.=.0457	sig.=.0000		sig.=.0622	sig.=.0000

Table 3. Contact Patterns by Three Family Composition Variables
A Comparison of the 1950 and 1970 Samples

Family Composition Variables	1950 Sample N	1950 Sample Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	1950 Sample Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts	1970 Sample N	1970 Sample Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	1970 Sample Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts
resence of a elative in the ousehold						
no	3765	1.5%	15.5%	1001	3.6%	18.8%
yes	291	1.4	14.8	83	2.4	19.3
		sig.=.8921	sig.=.8119		sig.=.7992	sig.=.9720
resence of a aramour in the ousehold						
no	3898	1.5%	15.0%	1054	3.5%	18.3%
yes	158	1.3	27.2	30	3.3	36.7
		sig.=.8913	sig.=.0000		sig.=.6517	sig.=.0215
hild Born Out of edlock						
no	3625	1.5%	15.0%	1691	2.5%	12.1%
yes	802	.7	14.3	252	2.0	22.6
		sig.=.1541	sig.=.6560		sig.=.8795	sig.=.0000

Table 4. Contact Patterns by Combination Family Structures
A Comparison of the 1950 and 1970 Samples

Family Composition Variables	1950 Sample N	1950 Sample Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	1950 Sample Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts	1970 Sample N	1970 Sample Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	1970 Sample Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts
Born out of Wedlock						
Mother and Father present	189	1.1%	11.1%	25	4.0%	16.0%
Father only present	26	0.0	19.2	9	0.0	22.2
Mother only present	450	.7	16.2	124	2.4	35.5
Born in Wedlock						
Mother and Father present	2029	2.1	15.8	508	3.7	12.8
Father only present	317	0.0	12.3	52	3.8	21.2
Mother only present	1017	1.0	16.1	361	3.6	21.3
		sig.=.0096	sig.=.2891		sig.=.9714	sig.=.0000
Female-headed Households with:						
one child	88	0.0%	10.2%	52	0.0%	5.8%
two to four children	554	1.3	13.7	154	3.9	22.7
five to seven children	347	.6	15.9	130	3.1	25.4
eight or more children	198	1.0	22.2	59	5.1	45.8
		sig.=.5752	sig.=.0180		sig.=.4642	sig.=.0000

Table 5. Contact Patterns by Parental Presence and Family Size
A Comparison of the 1950 and 1970 Samples
By Sex

Family Composition Variables	1950 Sample N	1950 Sample Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	1950 Sample Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts	1970 Sample N	1970 Sample Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	1970 Sample Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts
MALES						
Both parents present	1144	2.4%	18.8%	397	3.5%	12.1%
Father only present	180	0.0	13.9	49	4.1	20.4
Mother only present	763	.8	18.5	333	3.0	23.7
		sig.=.0038	sig.=.2798		sig.=.8854	sig.=.0002
One child	153	.7%	9.8%	300	.7%	3.0%
Two to four children	991	1.2	15.4	522	2.3	11.1
Five to seven children	659	1.5	18.7	421	3.8	16.6
Eight or more children	487	2.3	23.6	169	3.0	26.6
		sig.=.3575	sig.=.0001		sig.=.0616	sig.=.0000
FEMALES						
Both parents present	1080	1.7%	11.9%	136	4.4%	15.4%
Father only present	166	0.0	11.4	14	0.0	21.4
Mother only present	719	1.0	13.5	155	3.9	27.7
		sig.=.1362	sig.=.5424		sig.=.7200	sig.=.0408
One child	145	.7%	6.9%	114	.9%	6.1%
Two to four children	883	1.0	9.2	204	2.9	13.7
Five to seven children	701	.9	12.1	178	2.2	18.0
Eight or more children	437	2.3	18.3	54	1.9	29.6
		sig.=.1313	sig.=.0000		sig.=.6842	sig.=.0006

Table 6. Contact Patterns by Three Family Composition Variables: A Comparison of the 1950 and 1970 Samples By Sex

Family Composition Variables	1950 Sample N	1950 Sample Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	1950 Sample Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts	1970 Sample N	1970 Sample Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	1970 Sample Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts
MALES						
Relative present in home						
no	1944	1.6%	18.5%	727	3.3%	17.3%
yes	143	1.4	15.4	52	3.8	21.2
		sig.=.9072	sig.=.4186		sig.=.8507	sig.=.6094
Paramour present in home						
no	2015	1.7%	17.7%	759	3.3%	17.0%
yes	72	0.0	33.3	20	5.0	40.0
		sig.=.5237	sig.=.0013		sig.=.8327	sig.=.0178
Child born out of wedlock						
no	1866	1.7%	18.3%	1223	2.6%	11.9%
yes	411	.5	15.6	171	1.8	19.3
		sig.=.1023	sig.=.2203		sig.=.6789	sig.=.0101
FEMALES						
Relative present in home						
no	1818	1.3%	12.3%	274	4.4%	22.6%
yes	147	1.4	13.6	31	0.0	16.1
		sig.=.7770	sig.=.7458		sig.=.4830	sig.=.5488
Paramour present in home						
no	1879	1.2%	12.0%	295	4.1%	21.7%
yes	86	2.3	22.1	10	0.0	30.0
		sig.=.6897	sig.=.0089		sig.=.8601	sig.=.8138
Child born out of wedlock						
no	1754	1.2%	11.6%	468	2.1%	12.6%
yes	391	1.0	13.0	81	2.5	29.6
		sig.=.9763	sig.=.4673		sig.=.8238	sig.=.0002

Table 7. Contact Patterns by Combination Family Structures
A Comparison of the 1950 and 1970 Samples
By Sex

Family Composition Variables	1950 Sample N	1950 Sample Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	1950 Sample Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts	1970 Sample N	1970 Sample Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	1970 Sample Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts
MALES						
Born out of Wedlock						
Mother and Father present	105	1.0%	13.3%	17	5.9%	17.6%
Father only present	14	0.0	14.3	8	0.0	12.5
Mother only present	220	.5	18.2	78	1.3	30.8
Born in Wedlock						
Mother and Father present	1037	2.6	19.4	380	3.4	11.8
Father only present	164	0.0	14.0	39	5.1	23.1
Mother only present	536	.9	18.7	253	3.6	21.3
		sig.=.0249	sig.=.4473		sig.=.8405	sig.=.0007
Female-headed Households with:						
one child	47	0.0%	10.6%	41	0.0%	2.4%
two to four children	287	1.4	15.3	102	2.9	22.5
five to seven children	196	.5	20.4	83	2.4	21.7
eight or more children	94	0.0	25.5	44	4.5	43.2
		sig.=.4548	sig.=.0588		sig.=.6115	sig.=.0002
FEMALES						
Born out of Wedlock						
Mother and Father present	84	1.2%	8.3%	8	0.0%	12.5%
Father only present	12	0.0	25.0	1	0.0	100.0
Mother only present	230	.9	14.3	46	4.3	43.5
Born in Wedlock						
Mother and Father present	991	1.6	12.1	128	4.7	15.6
Father only present	151	0.0	9.9	13	0.0	15.4
Mother only present	480	1.0	13.3	108	3.7	21.3
		sig.=.6057	sig.=.3997		sig.=.9518	sig.=.0014
Female-headed Households with:						
one child	41	0.0%	9.8%	11	0.0%	18.2%
two to four children	267	1.1	12.0	52	5.8	23.1
five to seven children	151	.7	9.9	47	4.3	31.9
eight or more children	103	1.9	19.4	15	6.7	53.3
		sig.=.6984	sig.=.1271		sig.=.8479	sig.=.1153

Table 8. Contact Patterns by Parental Presence and Family Size: A Comparison of the 1950 and 1970 Samples By Race

Family Composition Variables	1950 Sample N	1950 Sample Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	1950 Sample Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts	1970 Sample N	1970 Sample Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	1970 Sample Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts
WHITES						
Both parents present	1465	2.1%	15.6%	228	2.6%	15.4%
Father only present	211	0.0	12.8	22	4.5	22.7
Mother only present	721	1.0	17.6	138	6.5	32.6
		sig.=.0204	sig.=.1998		sig.=.1920	sig.=.0006
one child	151	0.0%	7.3%	121	.8%	4.1%
two to four children	1098	1.2	13.8	326	2.1	11.3
five to seven children	792	1.5	16.0	237	3.4	18.1
eight or more children	553	2.4	19.7	76	5.3	26.3
		sig.=.1183	sig.=.0005		sig.=.2211	sig.=.0000
BLACKS						
Both parents present	454	2.6%	18.1%	180	7.2%	17.8%
Father only present	93	0.0	14.0	27	3.7	25.9
Mother only present	529	.4	15.3	291	1.7	23.7
		sig.=.0039	sig.=.4125		sig.=.0101	sig.=.2715
one child	87	1.1%	11.5%	127	.8%	6.3%
two to four children	466	.9	11.8	290	3.4	15.9
five to seven children	395	1.0	15.4	302	3.0	16.2
eight or more children	269	2.2	24.9	128	1.6	28.9
		sig.=.4076	sig.=.0000		sig.=.3631	sig.=.0000

Table 9. Contact Patterns by Three Family Composition Variables
A Comparison of the 1950 and 1970 Samples
By Race

Family Composition Variables	1950 Sample N	1950 Sample Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	1950 Sample Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts	1970 Sample N	1970 Sample Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	1970 Sample Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts
WHITES						
Relative present in the home						
no	2254	1.6%	15.7%	357	4.2%	21.8%
yes	143	1.4	18.9	31	3.2	22.6
		sig.=.8722	sig.=.3820		sig.=.8347	sig.=.8951
Paramour present in the home						
no	2330	1.6%	15.7%	382	3.9%	21.2%
yes	67	0.0	23.9	6	16.7	66.7
		sig.=.5771	sig.=.1025		sig.=.6012	sig.=.0297
Child born out of wedlock						
no	2220	1.6%	15.9%	707	2.7%	13.4%
yes	353	.8	13.0	45	2.2	20.0
		sig.=.4157	sig.=.1991		sig.=.7720	sig.=.3106
BLACKS						
Relative present in the home						
no	954	1.5%	17.3%	456	3.9%	21.9%
yes	122	0.0	9.0	42	2.4	19.0
		sig.=.3562	sig.=.0280		sig.=.9313	sig.=.8118
Paramour present in the home						
no	1013	1.2%	15.4%	478	4.0%	21.1%
yes	63	3.2	31.7	20	0.0	35.0
		sig.=.4357	sig.=.0012		sig.=.7540	sig.=.2310
Child born out of wedlock						
no	854	1.5%	15.5%	658	2.7%	14.1%
yes	357	.6	16.8	185	2.2	24.3
		sig.=.2734	sig.=.6169		sig.=.8641	sig.=.0014

Table 10. Contact Patterns by Combination Family Structures
A Comparison of the 1950 and 1970 Samples
By Race

Family Composition Variables	1950 Sample N	1950 Sample Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	1950 Sample Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts	1970 Sample N	1970 Sample Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	1970 Sample Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts
WHITES						
Born out of Wedlock						
Mother and Father present	115	.9%	7.8%	5	0.0%	0.0%
Father only present	15	0.0	6.7	2	0.0	0.0
Mother only present	163	1.2	19.0	24	4.2	37.5
Born in Wedlock						
Mother and Father present	1347	2.2	16.3	223	2.7	15.7
Father only present	193	0.0	13.5	19	5.3	26.3
Mother only present	547	.9	17.4	114	7.0	31.6
		sig.=.1117	sig.=.0895		sig.=.5600	sig.=.0049
Female-headed Households with:						
one child	43	0.0%	7.0%	9	0.0%	0.0%
two to four children	295	1.7	15.9	54	3.7	31.5
five to seven children	186	1.1	16.7	35	5.7	31.4
eight or more children	83	0.0	26.5	9	33.3	66.7
		sig.=.5242	sig.=.0344		sig.=.0076	sig.=.0261
BLACKS						
Born out of Wedlock						
Mother and Father present	59	1.7%	20.3%	20	5.0%	20.0%
Father only present	10	0.0%	40.0	6	0.0	33.3
Mother only present	227	0.0	14.5	89	2.2	36.0
Born in Wedlock						
Mother and Father present	395	2.8	17.7	160	7.5	17.5
Father only present	81	0.0	9.9	21	4.8	23.8
Mother only present	299	.7	16.1	200	1.5	18.0
		sig.=.0360	sig.=.1370		sig.=.0822	sig.=.0125
Female-headed Households with:						
one child	25	0.0%	16.0%	29	0.0%	6.9%
two to four children	165	.6	12.1	78	3.8	19.2
five to seven children	119	0.0	17.6	84	1.2	22.6
eight or more children	78	0.0	17.9	48	0.0	43.8
		sig.=.7175	sig.=.5261		sig.=.2998	sig.=.0011

Table 11. Contact Patterns by Two Family Composition Variables
1950 Sample -- Founded and Unfounded Cases

Family Composition Variables	1950 Sample -- Founded Cases N	Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts	1950 Sample -- Unfounded Cases N	Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts
Paramour present in the home						
no	3080	1.8%	16.9%	790	.4%	7.8%
yes	137	1.5	29.2	21	0.0	14.3
		sig.=.9387	sig.=.0003		sig.=.1240	sig.=.5059
Child born out of wedlock						
no	2880	1.7%	17.3%	715	.4%	6.4%
yes	645	.9	14.1	155	0.0	15.5
		sig.=.1918	sig.=.0574		sig.=.9584	sig.=.0003

Table 12. Contact Patterns by Combination Family Structures
1950 Sample -- Founded and Unfounded Cases

Family Composition Variables	1950 Sample -- Founded Cases N	Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts	1950 Sample -- Unfounded Cases N	Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts
Born out of wedlock						
Mother and Father present	167	1.2%	11.4%	22	0.0%	9.1%
Father only present	21	0.0	14.3	5	0.0	40.0
Mother only present	342	.9	16.7	108	0.0	14.8
Born in wedlock						
Mother and Father present	1647	2.6	18.1	376	0.0	6.1
Father only present	258	0.0	13.2	57	0.0	8.8
Mother only present	758	.9	19.3	240	1.3	7.1
		sig.=.0042	sig.=.0742		sig.=.2114	sig.=.0073
Female-headed households with:						
one child	63	0.0%	9.5%	25	0.0%	12.0%
two to four children	379	1.3	17.2	171	1.2	6.4
five to seven children	280	.4	16.4	65	1.5	13.8
eight or more children	159	1.3	24.5	28	0.0	14.3
		sig.=.4844	sig.=.0390		sig.=.8630	sig.=.2326

Table 13. Contact Patterns by Two Family Composition Variables
1950 Sample -- Founded and Unfounded Cases
By Race

Family Composition Variables	1950 Sample -- Founded Cases N	Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts	1950 Sample -- Unfounded Cases N	Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts
WHITES						
Paramour present in the home						
no	1930	1.9%	17.1%	390	.5%	9.2%
yes	53	0.0	24.5	14	0.0	21.4
		sig.=.6298	sig.=.2199		sig.=.0951	sig.=.2901
Child born out of wedlock						
no	1840	1.8%	17.7%	368	.5%	7.3%
yes	290	1.0	11.0	62	0.0	22.6
		sig.=.4922	sig.=.0064		sig.=.6694	sig.=.0004
BLACKS						
Paramour present in the home						
no	593	1.9%	20.2%	179	0.0%	7.8%
yes	46	2.2	39.1	3	0.0	0.0
		sig.=.6816	sig.=.0049		no test	sig.=.5564
Child born out of wedlock						
no	494	2.2%	20.9%	138	0.0%	5.1%
yes	237	.8	19.8	57	0.0	17.5
		sig.=.3053	sig.=.8247		no test	sig.=.0114

Table 14. Contact Patterns by Combination Family Structures
1950 Sample -- Founded and Unfounded Cases
By Race

Family Composition Variables	1950 Sample -- Founded Cases N	Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts	1950 Sample -- Unfounded Cases N	Abuse & Juvenile Contacts	Maltreatment & Juvenile Contacts
WHITES						
Child born out of wedlock						
Mother and Father present	103	1.0%	7.8%	12	0.0%	8.3%
Father only present	15	0.0	6.7	0	---	---
Mother only present	123	1.6	16.3	40	0.0	27.5
Child born in wedlock						
Mother and Father present	1122	2.7	18.2	220	0.0	6.8
Father only present	171	0.0	12.9	21	0.0	19.0
Mother only present	433	.7	20.1	110	1.8	7.3
		sig.=.0426	sig.=.0227		sig.=.2529	sig.=.0006
Female-headed households with:						
one child	28	0.0%	3.6%	15	0.0%	13.3%
two to four children	219	1.8	19.2	73	1.4	6.8
five to seven children	153	.7	15.0	32	3.1	25.0
eight or more children	75	0.0	28.0	8	0.0	12.5
		sig.=.4595	sig.=.0187		sig.=.8277	sig.=.0817
BLACKS						
Child born out of wedlock						
Mother and Father present	37	2.7%	27.0%	6	0.0%	16.7%
Father only present	3	0.0	66.7	4	0.0	50.0
Mother only present	151	0.0	17.9	43	0.0	11.6
Child born in wedlock						
Mother and Father present	234	4.7	23.1	68	0.0	1.5
Father only present	40	0.0	15.0	18	0.0	5.6
Mother only present	171	0.0	22.8	42	0.0	9.5
		sig.=.0042	sig.=.2262		no test	sig.=.0079
Female-headed households with:						
one child	15	0.0%	6.7%	5	0.0%	20.0%
two to four children	84	0.0	16.7	36	0.0	11.1
five to seven children	92	0.0	21.7	16	0.0	6.3
eight or more children	48	0.0	27.1	10	0.0	0.0
		no test	sig.=.2707		no test	sig.=.5559

REFERENCES

Alfaro, J.
1978 Report on the Relationship Between Child Abuse and Neglect and Later Socially Deviant Behavior. Report to the New York State Assembly Select Committee on Child Abuse.

Bennie, E. and A. Sclare
1969 The Battered Child Syndrome. American Journal of Psychiatry, 125(7): 975-979.

Chilton, R.
1972 Family Disruption, Delinquent Conduct and the Effect of Subclassification. American Sociological Review, 37:93-99.

Gelles, R. J.
1974 The Violent Home: A Study of Physical Aggression Between Husbands and Wives. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publications.

1977 Violence Towards Children in the United States. Paper presented at the 1977 meetings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Denver.

Gil, D.
1970 Violence Against Children: Physical Child Abuse in the United States. Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press.

Glueck, S. and E. Glueck
1950 Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. Cambridge, Ma.: Harvard University Press.

Hirschi, T. and H. C. Selvin
1967 Delinquency Research: An Appraisal of Analytic Methods. New York: The Free Press.

Jenkins, R. L.
1974 Deprivation of Parental Care as a Contributor to Juvenile Delinquency. In Childhood Deprivation, Albert R. Roberts, ed., Springfield, Ill.: Charles Thomas Co.

Johnson, C. L.
1974 Child Abuse in the Southeast: Analysis of 1172 Reported Cases. Athens, Ga.: Regional Institute of Social Welfare Research.

Nye, F. I.
1958 Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior. New York: Wiley.

Straus, M. A. and R. J. Gelles
1978 Violence in the American Family. Garden City, New York: Doubleday-Anchor.

Wasserman, S.
1967 The Abused Parent of the Abused Child. Children, 14 (Sept.-Oct.): 175-179.

Webb, E. J., D. T. Campbell, R. D. Schwartz, and L. Sechrest
1966 Unobtrusive Measures: Non-reactive Research in the Social Sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Zalba, S.
1971 Battered Children. Transaction, 8(July-August):58-61.

APPENDIX A

REFERRAL REASONS FOR CONTACTS WITH OFFICIAL AGENCIES IN NEW YORK

"Referral reason" means the act or acts or reason or reasons which brought the case to the agency's or Court's attention.

Child maltreatment (Abuse):

01 Brutally or continually battered -- bestial, extreme, vicious attack on child

02 Other physical attacks

03 Risks of physical injury to child

Child maltreatment (Other):

04 Sex offenses against child -- sexual abuse of child by parents

05 Impairment of mental and/or emotional health of child

06 Inadequate food, shelter and clothing, such as to impair the physical health of child, exclusive of malnutrition

07 Malnutrition

08 Inadequate educational care -- e.g. parents fail to insure that child attends school

09 Inadequate medical or surgical care

10 Abandonment or desertion

11 Involuntary parental absence -- e.g. jail or hospitalization of parent

12 Parental use of drugs

13 Parental alcoholism

14 Parental sexual misconduct

15 Parental mental illness, emotional disturbance or retardation

16 Parental fighting (verbal and/or physical)

17 Inadequate supervision, e.g. mother leaving home with child either unattended or in the care of another minor child

Juvenile offenses:

18 Homicide

19 Arson

20 Rape

21 Other sex crimes

22 Narcotics violation

23 Robbery -- steal from person

24 Burglary -- steal from house

25 Assault

26 Auto theft (only when specified as auto)

27 Unauthorized use of auto (joy riding)

28 Larceny, not auto

29 Dangerous weapons (possession and/or use of firearms)

30 Malicious mischief

31 Unlawful entry

32 Burglar's tools

33 Gambling

34 Receiving stolen property

35 Unlawful assembly

36 Disorderly conduct, e.g. loitering or abusive or obscene language, or harrassment

Status offenses/ungovernability:

37 Running away from home (including institution or foster home)

38 Habitual truancy

39 Refusal to obey

40 Sexual misconduct

41 Staying out late

42 Associating with bad companions

43 Using vile language (not to be confused with Disorderly conduct definition of abusive or obscene language, see code 36)

44 Intoxication

45 Glue sniffing

Other referral reasons:*

46 Other status offense

47 Placement (temporary or permanent)

48 Evaluation (psychiatric or medical)

49 Violation of probation

50 Family offenses

51 Non-support

52 Parent previously alleged to have abused or neglected a child

53 Parent previously alleged to have abused a child (in addition to specific child abuse or neglect reason, if known)

54 Parent previously reported as an abused or neglected child (in addition to specific child abuse or neglect reason, if known)

55 Other or unknown

56 Parents request for placement

* Other referral reasons 47 through 49 pertain to an agency referral, including parents and children. 50 through 56 pertain to parents only.

SECTION THREE

REFINEMENTS ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BEING REPORTED AS A MALTREATED CHILD AND LATER BEING REPORTED AS A JUVENILE OFFENDER

Andréa Carr

University of Rhode Island

October, 1978

Prepared As Part Of A Final Report Submitted To:

NATIONAL CENTER ON CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

Children's Bureau/Administration on Children Youth and Families

Office of Human Development Services/Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Research Supported by Grant Number 90-C425

Refinements on the Relationship Between Being Reported as a Maltreated Child and Later Being Reported as a Juvenile Offender

Our purpose in this report is to refine our examination of the association between being in contact with officials as an allegedly maltreated child and later having an official contact for a juvenile offense among children with two or more official contacts of any kind. In an earlier paper we reported that 17.2 percent of a sample of children selected because they were in contact with officials for child maltreatment were later officially in contact for a juvenile offense (Carr, 1977).[1] Among those with at least one valid maltreatment contact, 18.8 percent later had a juvenile contact. One in five children reported as maltreated was later reported as a juvenile offender.

Children with only one officially recorded agency contact (a maltreatment contact in almost all cases, due to the sampling design) were included in our earlier research. At least two official contacts are obviously necessary for a child to have both a maltreatment and a juvenile contact (an "interaction" pattern of contacts). Thus, in this report we focus on children with at least two official agency contacts.[2]

In earlier research we noted four factors that would have the effect of reducing the association between contacts for maltreatment and contacts for juvenile offenses that could actually be empirically demostrated with the data: 1) the destruction and/or misplacement of official records; 2) the death and/or institutionalization of the child reported as maltreated; 3) inter-county and inter-state migration of families; and, 4) the eligibility[3] of a child for a juvenile contact. The purpose of this paper is to elaborate on the impact of the fourth factor. We expect the impact of the age of the child reported as maltreated, at his or her second and third official contact, to increase the

relationship between maltreatment and juvenile contacts, to the extent that the child is"eligible" at contact two and three for a juvenile offense.

As this research effort deals primarily with children with multiple contacts with the official systems for children and juveniles, we will examine the impact of the disposition of a case at the time of the first contact on later contacts. We intend also to examine the effects of disposition patterns. That is, among children with at least three official contacts, does the pattern of case disposition at contacts one and two affect the liklihood of a later contact being a juvenile contact?

BACKGROUND

Many decades of social research have shown some factors consistently related to crime and juvenile delinquency. Research on abused and neglected children, while more recent in vintage, has found similar factors related to child maltreatment. We present a brief comparison of the two sets of research findings as background to our focus on the relationship between child maltreatment and later delinquency.

Although Wootton's (1959) analysis of 21 research efforts selected because of their "comparative methodological merit" led her to a pessimistic view of the progress of crime and delinquency research, Hirschi and Selvin (1967) present a more exact and more optimistic statement of Wootton's evidence:

1. The larger the family, the more likely the child is to become delinquent.
2. Criminality among other members of the family is fairly strongly related to delinquency.
3. Church attendance is negatively related to delinquency.

4. No good evidence has been collected to suggest that club membership is related to delinquency, either positively or negatively.
5. Poor workers are more likely than good workers to be delinquent.
6. Delinquency is negatively related to social class.
7. Taken as a whole, these studies suggest a relation between poverty and delinquency.
8. Employment of the mother outside the home is not related to delinquency.
9. There is no relation between health and delinquency.
10. The better the child's performance in school, the less likely he is to become delinquent.
11. Truancy and delinquency are highly related.
12. Children from broken homes are at least slightly more likely than children from intact homes to become delinquent.

(Hirschi and Selvin, 1967:25)

While abused and neglected children have been a part of our modern society for centuries (Radbill, 1968), serious research efforts on this form of family interaction began less than twenty years ago, although pediatric radiologists were aware of abused children somewhat earlier (Caffey, 1946; Kempe, et al., 1962). In this short time some factors have been fairly consistently found to be associated with child abuse and neglect: larger families;[4] parents or caretakers who were themselves abused as children;[5] unemployment of the male caretaker;[6] lower socio-economic status class and poverty;[7] and, broken homes.[8] Religious background has not consistently been shown to be associated with child abuse and neglect, and membership in clubs and organizations have, similarly,

been variables largely ignored in child abuse and neglect literature. In their stead, isolation had been found associated with abuse and neglect.[9] The health of the child appears to be inversely related to child abuse and neglect.[10] Working mothers appear to be unrelated to child abuse and neglect.[11]

Nine of the twelve factors related to crime and delinquency are also related, in a similar fashion, to child maltreatment. Two factors, poor school performance and truancy are likely to be forms of behavior resulting from child maltreatment, or at least unhappy home environments.

Only for one item is the relationship different: poor health (congenital disease, colic, retardation, hyperactivity and other health problems of children) have been found to be associated with child abuse and neglect. Many childhood health problems may be resolved by the time the child is old enough to be considered delinquent. All these health problems would put additional burdens on a family when the child was young (creating, perhaps, enough stress for child abuse to occur).[12]

Some health problems would disappear in later childhood and adolencence (e.g., colic); some would, presumably, be adapted to (e.g., congenital disease, retardation). Thus, nine of the ten relevant factors are found to be associated with both crime and delinquency and child abuse and neglect.

Child maltreatment is likely to preceed delinquency and/or criminal behavior. Perhaps the factors strongly associated with child maltreatment are those meriting attention. In fact, some of the factors associated with crime and delinquency may actually reflect that child maltreatment has occurred: large families may reflect strained family resources resulting in a higher probability of child abuse and neglect; broken homes may reflect neglect of the parent-child relationship in favor of other "adult relationships" that may take on added importance, or a sense of isolation on the part of the remaining caretaker; poverty may reflect a cumulation of serious stresses on families, etc.

In essence, then, much delinquency research may have, in reality, been examining factors that can or do represent child abuse and neglect. In this research we have the opportunity to directly examine the relationship of child maltreatment to later delinquency.

SAMPLE

Our sample consists of all children (and their siblings) reported for maltreatment in the early 1950s in eight counties in New York state (see Alfaro, 1978). Specifically, in two counties all children reported in 1952 were selected, in one county all children reported in 1953 were selected, in one county all children reported in 1951 and 1954 were selected, and in two counties all children reported in 1952 and 1953 were selected. Two counties had very large caseloads and thus only children reported in February, July and October of 1953 were selected. The final sample size is 4463 children.[13]

The children included in the sample (the 1950 sample) were traced forward for at least twenty years, and backward in the county records (as far as county records existed) for any other agency contacts they may have had (either for child maltreatment or for juvenile offenses). The data, then, are longitudinal and "non-reactive" (Webb, et al., 1966).

There are problems with this sample. First, the data collection process relied on official records, and therefore not all children who are maltreated or delinquent are represented. Furthermore, use of official records forces us to rely on official definitions of maltreatment and delinquency. These definitions are likely to vary over time as public awareness and administrative policies change.

These data come from only eight counties in one state. Analytic results are not even generalizable to those eight counties due to the sampling procedures noted above. However, the sample size, the longitudinal design, the lack of "recall" problems and the non-reactive measurements of key variables allow us to

use the results to suggest useful directios for further research using representative samples.

PROCEDURES

To conduct the proposed research it was necessary to limit the analysis to children (in the 1950 sample of reportedly maltreated children) with at least two contacts with official agencies (child protective or juvenile agencies). Fortunately, for our purposes, over one-half of the 1950 sample did have two or more official contacts and over one-third had at least three official contacts (for maltreatment and/or for juvenile offenses).

Interaction Contact Patterns. Our dependent variable in this research is actually a relationship: the relationship between having an early contact with officials as an allegedly maltreated child and later having a contact with officials for a juvenile offense. If a child did have both a maltreatment contact and any later juvenile contact, we refer to this as an "interaction contact pattern." Operationally, an interaction contact pattern is defined as a maltreatment contact[14] at the time of the child's first contact with officials, and at least one contact for a juvenile offense or a status offense[15] among the next eleven contacts[16] the child may have had with official agencies.

Eligibility. Over the twenty-odd year period covered by our sample there was a statutory change in the age at which a child was eligible (old enough and young enough) to be charged with a status offense. However, for the major portion of the two decades covered, children between seven and eighteen years of age were eligible for status offenses and juvenile contacts. Thus, we have operationally defined those eligible for a juvenile contact as those between seven and eighteen years of age.

Case Disposition. Once a case (maltreatment or a juvenile offense) is reported to officials, some action will be taken, even if the "action" is "no action." The action taken in a case at the time a child is in contact with a

particular agency is the case disposition. Ideally, that disposition precludes any necessity for further official contacts. We have defined the "action" of the agency at the time the case is open as the case disposition and coded it into four major categories: 1) no further action; 2) child referred to another agency; 3) child released[17] to the caretaker with supervision; and, 4) child removed from the home.

For each contact with an agency there is a case disposition. If a child has two or more contacts, then, it is possible to examine patterns of dispositions and their possible affects on interaction contact patterns (having both a maltreatment and a juvenile contact). For example, a child may be referred to another agency at his first contact and removed from his home at his second contact, suggesting a disposition pattern that may have been too "lenient" at the time of the first contact. Disposition patterns, then, refer to the combination of the case disposition at the time of the first contact and the case disposition at the time of the second contact.

High- and Low-Contact Counties. The sample design for this research was intra-county and the counties were selected to reflect the geographical and social diversity of New York state. In some counties the average number of agency contacts-per-child was low -- one or two, while in other counties multiple contacts were frequent. The low number of contacts-per-child for some counties (the four counties falling below the total mean were defined in this research as low-contact counties) may be explained by several factors.

First, some counties may have "successful" child service agencies, reducing the number of contacts a child will have. Second, some counties may have few agencies (or small personnel forces) dealing with children, thereby reducing the probability of agency contact. Third, some counties may have trouble maintaining case reports (see Alfaro, 1978), and therefore the number of contacts a child has in our data may be reduced. Finally, in some counties there may actually be fewer maltreated children and/or children involved in juvenile misconduct.

Where the number of cases has been large enough, we have presented data separately for each county in the sample. When that was not possible we have grouped high- and low-contact counties and examined their subtotals. Because we are dealing in this research with children with multiple contacts, we have occasionally been forced to examine all counties together and must caution that this procedure overrepresents the high-contact-per-child counties.

RESULTS

Among our sample children, selected because they or their sibling(s) had a maltreatment contact in the early 1950s, 19.5 percent later had an official contact for a juvenile offense (Table 1). That is, one in five children, once reported as maltreated, are later in contact with officials for juvenile offenses. These figures are similar to figures we reported earlier, although our current measure of "interaction contact patterns" is a slightly altered version.

Fifty-six percent of the children reported as maltreated did have a second contact with one or another official system of child protection and/or juvenile justice (Table 2). Over thirty-five percent of the children had at least three official contacts. One in three children once reported as maltreated are later reported at least twice more as either maltreated or as juvenile offenders.

It is clear that many children have multiple contacts with the official system.[18] For some children, it may be that their second or third contacts are, again, maltreatment contacts. In fact, because children reported as maltreated are likely to be very young (under three), they may not be old enough (eligible) for a juvenile contact at the time of their second or third contacts with officials. Indeed, among children with multiple contacts we would expect that a higher proportion would be eligible for a juvenile contact by the time of their third contact than by the time of their second contact. More time having elapsed, the children would have grown older, old enough perhaps, for a juvenile

contact. This increases the possibility of a juvenile contact being empirically demonstrated. It does not necessarily increase the possibility of juvenile contact actually occuring.

Just over fifty percent of the children with two or more contacts are eligible for a juvenile contact at the time of their second contact and about 65 percent are eligible at the time of their third contact (Table 3). From another viewpoint, this means that half of the children initially reported as maltreated are not old enough, by the time of their second contact, to be considered a juvenile offender. A third of the children are still not old enough by the time of their third contact.

The fact that a large proportion of children are not eligible for a juvenile contact by the time of their second and third contacts with officials necessarily reduces the association that can be found between having a maltreatment contact and later having a juvenile contact. Therefore, we will examine the types of contact a child has had only if they are eligible for a juvenile contact at the time of their second or third contact.

In our earlier report, (Carr, 1977) we examined each county separately. We also noted that some counties had a low average number of contacts-per-child, a result in many cases of lost or destroyed records and changes in county record-keeping policy. Thus, we deemed it appropriate to examine low-contact-per-child counties as a group, and similarly, high-contact-per-child counties. We repeat this procedure here.

Among children eligible for a juvenile contact at the time of their second contact, between 27 percent and 64 percent were at some subsequent time in contact with officials for a juvenile offense (Table 4). Overall, 41 percent were later reported as juvenile offenders. Suffolk county is the only county with an interaction contact pattern percentage below 30 percent.[19]

Looking at children with at least three contacts, between 29 percent and 88 percent of children eligible for a juvenile contact by the time of their third

contact do have a subsequent juvenile contact (Table 4). If Suffolk county is eliminated, the interaction percentages range from 35 percent to 88 percent. Overall, nearly 50 percent of children eligible at third contact subsequently are in contact with officials for juvenile offenses.

In the high-contact-per-child counties about 40 percent of children once reported for maltreatment and eligible for a juvenile contact at the time of their second contact, do subsequently have a juvenile contact. Among those eligible by the time of their third contact, nearly half have a subsequent juvenile contact. In Monroe county, a county noted by Alfaro(1978) for particularly adequate record-keeping, the interaction percentage is 60 percent among children eligible at the time of their third contact. These last results are quite impressive as these are the counties with larger caseloads for both maltreatment and juvenile offenses, better county record-keeping and fewer gaps in records created by fire, loss and destruction (Alfaro, 1978).

The data (Table 4) also suggest that several maltreatment contacts may occur before a child is labeled a juvenile offender. In nearly all counties the percentage with an interaction contact pattern among those eligible at contact three is higher than among those eligible at contact two. Perhaps, children seven or eight years old, although technically eligible for a juvenile contact, are more likely than older children to be treated as maltreated children, regardless of the overt behavior bringing them to official attention. Or, perhaps, there is an association between the number of maltreatment contacts a child has and the likelihood of a subsequent juvenile contact. Multiple maltreatment contacts may increase the chances of juvenile misbehavior, or the chances of <u>being reported</u> as a juvenile offender.

Effects Of Dispositions

Officials dealing with children have a variety of alternative ways available to them for "action" in any particular case, ranging from "taking no further action"[20] to removing the child from the home. For our purposes, we have coded the disposition of cases into four categories: 1) no further action will be taken; 2) the child or family will be referred to another agency; 3) the child will be released with some supervision; and, 4) the child will be removed from the home and placed in another living environment.

An appropriate disposition of a reported maltreatment case should, in an ideal world, preclude further contacts. Perhaps, this often happens. We cannot directly address this issue with our data. We can, however, examine the effect of the disposition of the first report of maltreatment on the probability that a child will have an "interaction-contact-pattern" if he has a second and a third contact. In essence, we are examining the effectiveness of various case dispositions for reducing juvenile contacts among children with multiple (two or more) contacts.

Low-contact counties. Low-contact-per-child counties, by definition render this type of examination difficult. However, we can examine the subtotals for all four low-contact counties. In these counties 32.4 percent of those children for whom there was no action taken at the first opportunity and who were eligible for a juvenile contact at their second contact, had a juvenile contact (Table 5). If no further action was taken at the second system contact and the child was eligible for a juvenile contact at his or her third contact, 52.2 percent actually had a juvenile contact (interaction contact pattern) among children with multiple contacts.

A disposition whereby the child is released appears to have a similar impact on the probability of maltreatment and juvenile contact patterns. Sixty percent of the reportedly maltreated children released, with or without supervision, at the the time of their first contact, later have a juvenile contact if they are eligible by the time of their second contact (Table 5). Among children released

at their second contact, 70 percent later have a juvenile contact if they are eligible by the time of their third contact (the N's here, it should be noted, are quite small).

Low-contact counties may very well have few available resources for referrals. Only nine children, among those with a second contact (and eligible for a juvenile contact) are referred either to another agency,[21] or to the courts (Table 5). Only four such children are referred at the time of their second contact.

The most frequent disposition in low-contact counties is to remove the child from his home and place him with another relative or a public or private institution. Among children eligible for juvenile contacts, this is true for the disposition at the time of the first contact with the system and at the time of the second contact. We shall see below that removal of the child is not, proportionately, as frequent in high-contact-per-child counties. Among children placed outside the home at first contact and eligible for a juvenile contact at the time of the second contact, 49 percent actually have a juvenile contact (Table 5). Among children placed at the second contact and eligible by the time of the third contact, 57 percent actually have a juvenile contact.

These results appear contrary to our notions about the desirability of keeping the family together. Yet, we are dealing exclusively with older children here, those seven or older, and children who may be quite troubled -- they all have multiple contacts with the official system(s). While "lenient" dispositions such as "no further action" and "child released" made at the earliest opportunity appear to increase the probability of a later juvenile contact, the most remarkable results shown in Table 5 for low-contact counties may be the lack of effect a prior disposition has on later contacts with the official system.

Impacts of Disposition Patterns. Jose Alfaro (1978) reported that one of the most important findings revealed in his study of the relationship between child maltreatment and juvenile misconduct was that very little was done for the child

or his family once they were in contact with officials. Our time-ordered, re-analysis of Alfaro's data shows similar results (Table 6). Moreover, we find this to be especially true in high-contact counties.[22] Over 60 percent of the cases received no further action at the time of the first contact and 56 percent received no further action at the time of the second contact.

However, the action taken in a case (disposition) varies widely by county.[23] In Erie county no further action is taken at the time of first contact in 75 percent of the reported cases (Table 7). The equivalent percentage in Kings county is 48 percent. This range may reflect variation in the seriousness of the cases reported in different counties. It may reflect differences in county policy on what proportion of cases coming to agency attention are actually recorded as maltreatment cases. Furthermore, the range may reflect the resources available to county officials for taking further action. These county differences in disposition merit closer attention.

In Erie and Monroe counties no further action is taken in 60 to 75 percent of the cases at both the first and the second contact with the child (Table 7). In Kings and New York counties about half the cases receive no further action at first contact (and just over a third are so disposed if there is a second contact).

Overall, in just over 10 percent of the cases reported once, the child is removed from the home and, if two or more contacts occur the child is removed almost 20 percent of the time. In Monroe county removal is most likely at the time of first contact (24 percent of the cases), while in Kings county removal is most likely at the time of second contact (29 percent).

Referrals and supervised release of the child to his home are relatively rare in Erie and Monroe counties. On the other hand, in over one-third of the cases reported once or twice, some referral or release in the disposition taken in Kings and New York counties. In Kings county, referral and supervised release are about

equally common, both at the first contact and at the second contact. In New York county, referrals alone are much more common at first contact, but supervised release increases as an alternative at the time of the second contact.

Returning to the effects of disposition at first and second contact on the likelihood of interaction contact patterns, we find that for nearly all disposition patterns (combinations of the first and second type of disposition) the likelihood of both a maltreatment and a juvenile contact is higher if a child has three or more contacts than if a child has had two or more contacts (Table 8). Only for the disposition pattern "released at first contact, placed at second contact" is the interaction contact pattern percentage higher among children with two contacts than among children with three or more contacts.

Placing a child appropriately may reduce the likelihood of juvenile offense involvement. Indeed, while 38 percent of the reported maltreated children who are placed at first contact and released at second contact are later officially juvenile offenders (among those with two contacts), only 16 percent of those referred at first contact and subsequently placed are later juvenile offenders. Early placement combined with later referral or release is associated with moderate levels of juvenile contacts.

Releasing a child reported as maltreated tends to be associated with higher levels of juvenile involvement (Table 8). Among children with three or more contacts who are released at first contact, over 50 percent have later juvenile contacts unless they are placed at the time of their second contact.

Referral, which often includes evaluation to send the child to the agency expected to be able to most specifically address the child's problems, tends to be associated with relatively low levels of interaction contact patterns (Table 8). This is particularly true if the referral is made at the time of the first contact. Less than 20 percent of children with at least two contacts who are referred at both their first and second contact have interaction contact patterns. Only

21 percent of those referred at both their first and second contacts have interaction contact patterns among children with three or more contacts. Referral, especially when made early, appears effective.

DISCUSSION

In our analysis we have dealt primarily with a selected group of children: those with multiple agency contacts, within a county, for maltreatment and/or juvenile misconduct. Children who are repeatedly maltreated, but not reported to officials are not included in our analysis. Similarly, children who engage in various forms of juvenile misconduct, and yet are not "caught," are also excluded. While this limits our analysis in one sense, the limitation has one important advantage for policy formulation: those children included in our research are "known to officials" and are thereby accessible for "treatment." While past policy may have "failed" them, our research suggests the extent of this "failure" and some measures that may reduce such "failure."

Our efforts to protect children in our society should, of course, aim at preventing the necessity of even one contact with officials for child maltreatment. Realistically, though, for a large proportion of children society's first knowledge that a child is experiencing difficulty will occur at the time of his or her first contact with officials as allegedly maltreated. Certainly, that is a pivotal point in time for turning the tide of a child's growth and development. That is a focal point in time to undertake major efforts to help the child and his family resolve their problems. Yet, our research indicates that for a significant number of children such efforts are either not made or, probably more frequently, are ineffectively carried out.

We found that 56 percent of children once reported as maltreated had a second official contact, and of these children, 45 percent later were reported to officials as juvenile offenders if they were old enough by their second agency contact. We found over one-third of children reported as maltreated had three

or more agency contacts and nearly half of these children were later reported as juvenile offenders if they were "eligible" by their third agency contact. One in ten of all children once reported as maltreated have multiple agency contacts of which at least one is for juvenile misconduct. Early contact with officials for child abuse or neglect does not, for large numbers of children, "protect" them from further need for agency involvement.

The magnitude of the helplessness of official agencies in protecting children in trouble is further emphasized when it is realized that only about one percent of children between seven and seventeen years of age in the general population are charged as juvenile offenders.[24] Among reportedly maltreated children, one in five children later have juvenile contacts. Two in five children who are reported as maltreated, have a second contact and are old enough, are charged as juvenile offenders. One of every two children reported first as maltreated and then reported at least twice more are eventually charged with a juvenile offense if they are old enough by the time of their third contact.

It does appear that the greater the number of contacts (of whatever type) with the official system, the greater the likelihood of juvenile misconduct. Perhaps, the official system is reducing the potential for trouble in the form of juvenile misconduct for some children (those not included in our analysis). Still, a significant proportion of children appear to simply become more and more entrenched in the system and their problems continue taking on new forms (juvenile misconduct) as they grow older.

If contact with officials, in and of itself, does not provide the help that some children and families appear to need, then certain actions taken by agencies might be more effective than other actions. Our analysis, here, did suggest that referral to another agency tended to be the most effective case disposition in terms of lowering the rate of interaction contact patterns. Releasing a child to the caretaker with official supervision appeared to be a relatively ineffective case disposition.

When children are referred, the case worker may have identified a specific need of the child. Perhaps, referrals are more commonly made when the resources to "solve" particular problems of children and families are available. Or possibly, counseling is the more prevalent form of treatment received when a referral is made and this treatment, although it may be slow and expensive, is "effective." Releasing a child with supervision, on the other hand, may be a more cost-effective disposition, but social worker caseloads and bureaucratic entanglements may severly reduce the likelihood of this case disposition being carried out effectively.

The evidence presented in this analysis on the effects of taking no further action in a case must be tempered. While the analysis dealt with children with multiple contacts and thus one would be tempted to believe these children were, by virtue of repeated contacts alone, actually troubled (maltreated and/or juvenile offenders), we did not control for case validity. However, we do know that in the 1950 sample over 80 percent of the children had at least one valid maltreatment contact (Carr, 1977). Even if a maltreatment case <u>is</u> valid, it may well be "appropriate" to take no further action -- the incident leading to the maltreatment charge may be either a one-time occurrence, or the circumstances leading to maltreatment may have been remedied prior to agency involvement.

Perhaps the most interesting finding in regard to the effects of case disposition on the probability of interaction contact patterns was the amount of county variation. It seems possible, even, that case disposition is more dependent on available county resources than on the type and extent of maltreatment experienced by the child. If this is so, then we would expect case disposition to have relatively little effect on the probability that a child, once reported as maltreated, would later be in contact with officials as a juvenile offender. Clearly, case disposition and the child having an interaction contact pattern are not independent. Yet, the effects of case disposition seen in Table 8 are suggestive that other factors (perhaps available disposition resources) may be important. Factors affecting the choice

of case disposition, controlling for availability of resources, seems to be an avenue of research deserving future attention.

Finally, and contrary to our current folk wisdom about removing a child from his or her home, placement appears to reduce, relatively, the likelihood of a child having an interaction contact pattern. Probably, children who <u>are</u> placed are more severly maltreated and early removal from a family situation that is unlikely to improve may be "effective." Placement is certainly a more restrictive disposition in that at least while the placement is temporary the child is likely to be more closely observed and aided by official agents than with other case dispositions. This may help to reduce the likelihoood of other agency contact for other offenses. In any case, this research suggests that it is important that we re-examine placement of children reportedly maltreated, as it appears to be a useful disposition in some cases. Future research should be directed at specifying the particular kinds of maltreatment cases in which this case disposition has positive effects for the child, his family, and society.

Table 1. Contact Patterns: Total 1950 Sample of Children Reported as Maltreated

	N	%
Only abuse and/or neglect contacts	4463	80.5
Both maltreatment contacts and juvenile contacts	4463	19.5

Table 2. Percent of Children with at Least Two and at Least Three Agency Contacts Among 1950 Sample of Children Reported as Maltreated

	N	%
Children with at least two official agency contacts	4463	56.1
Children with at least three official agency contacts	4463	35.6

Table 3. Percent of Children Eligible for a Juvenile Contact

1950 Sample of Children Reported as Maltreated

	N	%
Among children with at least two official contacts, percentage eligible for a juvenile contact	2503	52.7
Among children with at least three official contacts, percentage eligible for a juvenile contact	1590	65.7

Table 4. Percent with Interaction Contact Patterns Among those Eligible 1950 Sample of Children Reported as Maltreated

		Children Eligible at Contact 2		Children Eligible at Contact 3	
		N	%	N	%
Broome		37	35.1	23	34.8
St. Lawrence		43	37.2	14	64.3
Suffolk		64	26.6	21	28.6
Westchester		103	64.1	42	88.1
	Subtotal	247	45.3	100	60.0
Erie		392	39.5	379	46.7
Kings		245	40.4	194	43.8
Monroe		209	45.9	173	60.1
New York		227	33.0	198	45.5
	Subtotal	1073	39.6	944	48.3
Total		1320	40.7	1044	49.4

Table 5. Percentage with Interaction Contact Patterns Among Eligible Children In Low-Contact-Per-Child Counties By Case Disposition at First Contact

1950 Sample of Reportedly Maltreated Children

Eligible for a Juvenile Contact	Disposition At First Contact							
	No Further Action		Referred		Released		Placed	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
At Second Contact	71	32.4	9	—	35	60.0	88	48.9
At Third Contact	23	52.2	4	—	30	70.0	35	57.1

Table 6. Case Dispositions at First and Second Official Contacts For The Whole Sample and For High-Contact Counties

1950 Sample of Reportedly Maltreated Children

	Disposition of Case at First Contact	Disposition of Case at Second Contact
No further action	54.9%	51.7%
Referred	13.3	12.9
Released	11.8	13.9
Placed	20.0	21.5
	(4239)	(2644)
High-Contact counties only		
No further action	63.3	55.6
Referred	16.1	14.3
Released	6.9	11.6
Placed	13.7	18.5
	(3168)	(2276)

Table 7. Variation in Case Dispositions at First and Second Contact In High Contact Counties

1950 Sample of Reportedly Maltreated Children

High Contact Counties	Disposition of Case at First Contact					Disposition of Case at Second Contact				
	N	No Action	Referred	Released	Placed	N	No Action	Referred	Released	Placed
Erie	1275	75.3%	7.8%	3.1%	13.9%	992	69.4%	9.6%	6.0%	15.0%
Kings	595	47.9	21.5	17.6	12.9	420	35.5	16.0	19.3	29.3
Monroe	492	62.4	7.3	6.5	23.8	374	68.4	8.3	6.4	16.8
New York	806	56.3	30.5	5.2	7.9	490	35.3	26.9	20.2	17.6
Total	3168	63.3	16.1	6.9	13.7	2276	55.6	14.3	11.6	18.5

Table 8. Percentage of Children with Interaction Contact Patterns Among Children with Various Case Disposition Patterns

1950 Sample of Reportedly Maltreated Children

Disposition at Second Contact	Disposition at First Contact: No Further Action N	%	Referred N	%	Released N	%	Placed N	%
Children with at least two contacts:								
No further action	999	35.4	140	29.3	72	45.8	114	35.1
Referred	170	32.4	69	18.8	34	38.2	55	21.8
Released	125	48.0	92	29.3	75	36.0	69	27.5
Placed	161	36.6	161	16.1	53	37.7	173	34.7
Children with at least three contacts:								
No further action	648	35.5	106	36.8	48	52.1	64	46.9
Referred	140	32.9	58	20.7	24	50.0	32	31.3
Released	93	48.4	52	48.1	34	52.9	33	33.3
Placed	104	46.2	68	27.9	32	34.4	96	43.8

Footnotes

1. The sample includes 4463 children (and their siblings) reported for maltreatment in eight New York counties in the early 1950s (Alfaro, 1978). The data are longitudinal and any further official contacts the sample children had (for maltreatment or for juvenile offenses) for the next twenty years were recorded.

2. Some children have many more contacts on record, as many as twenty-one.

3. Eligibility is used to indicate the child is old enough, by law, to have a juvenile contact at the time of the contact. A child can, of course, have a maltreatment contact at any age.

4. See Young, 1964; Johnson and Morse, 1968; Gil, 1970; Light, 1973; Straus, 1976; Farrington, 1977; Carr, 1978; and, Carr, Gelles and Hargreaves, 1978.

5. While there is a great quantity of literature supporting the notion that the parents of abused children were themselves abused as children, the quality varies greatly. See, Bowen, 1966, 1971; Bryant et al., 1963, Craft, 1969; Galdston, 1965; Jenkins, et al. , 1970; Justice and Justice, 1976; Lystadt, 1975; Oliver and Taylor, 1971; Owens and Straus, 1975; Sedgely, 1977; Silver, Dublin and Lourie, 1969; Spinetta and Rigler, 1972; Steinmetz, 1977a and b; Wasserman, 1967; and Zalba, 1966.

6. In some cases job dissatisfaction and dissatisfaction with the ability to carry out the breadwinner role are found associated with child abuse and neglect (Levinger, 1966; O'Brien, 1971; Prescott and Letko, 1977; and, McKinley, 1964). Gil (1970), Merril (1962) and Light (1973) find unemployment of the father associated with abuse and neglect and Allen and Straus (1975) find this association only among working class fathers.

7. In general low social status has been consistently found to be associated with child abuse and neglect (Kohn, 1969; Blumberg, 1964-65; Gil, 1970; Holter and Friedman, 1968; Elmer, 1971; Bennie and Sclare, 1969; Steinmetz and Straus, 1971; and Justice and Justice, 1976). Erlanger (1974) also finds this association but the r he finds is lower than generally found. Gil (1975) and Justice and Justice (1976) find poverty associated with child abuse and Kempe (1971) does so conditionally. The consistency, however, of the low social status - child abuse association does not speak to the issue of the presence of abuse in higher status families, or to the specific reasons low status families may be more likely to abuse their children, or get labeled as abusers (Steinmetz, 1978).

8. Unike delinquency research, research specifically linking broken homes and child abuse and neglect is not prolific. Gil (1970), Thompson, et al. (1971), Carr (1978) and Carr, Gelles and Hargreaves (1978), present some evidence supporting this association. Justice and Justice (1976) find child maltreatment frequently linked with homes where a step parent is present.

9. Elmer (1971) showed abusing mothers were less likely to be affiliated with a church than non-abusing mothers. Merril (1962) and Elmer (1971) found lack of membership in clubs and organizations to be associated with child abuse and neglect, but the bulk of research shows a relationship between isolation and abuse (Schloesser, 1964; Elmer and Gregg, 1967; Melnick and Hurley, 1969; Gil, 1970; Elmer, 1971; Kempe, 1971; Sanders, 1972; Lenoski, 1974; Helfer,1974; and, Justice and Duncan, 1975).

10. Mental retardation of the child has been shown to be associated with child abuse and neglect (Sandgrund, Gaines and Green, 1974; Martin, et al., 1974). Researchers have also found various other mental and physical conditions of the child to be related to child maltreatment (Green, 1968; Johnson and Morse, 1968; Gil, 1970; Harrington, 1972; and, Soeffing, 1975). Some researchers have found an association between child maltreatment and a perception on the part of the caretaker that the child is ill, or at least "different" (Flynn, 1970; Bishop, 1971; Kempe, 1971; Martin, 1972; Justice and Duncan, 1975; Friedrich and Boriskin, 1976).

11. Working mothers have not been the focus of much child abuse and neglect research. However, Justice and Justice (1976) report no relationship between working mothers and child abuse.

12. Some researchers suggest the actual mistreatment of children leads to subsequent health problems. The direction of "cause" is unknown, yet the association appears substantiated.

13. A similar sample of juvenile offenders, the 1970 sample, exists, but as we are focusing on the likelihood of a child once reported as maltreated later having a juvenile contact we use only the 1950 sample in this research.

14. Sexual abuse of children seems to represent complex motivations and interactions that may make it quite distinct from other forms of child maltreatment. Therefore, sexual abuse, because it is not necessarily aimed at harming the child has been excluded. Sexual abuse represents a very small proportion of the maltreatment cases in our sample.

15. Appendix A specifies the exact behaviors that were used to define juvenile and status offenses.

16. Less than three percent of the sample had more than eleven contacts.

17. Also included in this category are a few children released to the parent who is not the caretaker at the time of the official contact.

18. In this report we have limited our analysis to three contacts. Over 75 percent of the sample children did not have a fourth contact and nearly 90 percent had no fifth contact.

19. In our earlier research we saw that Suffolk county had an extremely high net migration rate from 1950 to 1960 -- over six times that of any other county. As the records we are relying on are intra-county, it is not surprising that Suffolk county would show a low interaction rate.

20. Some action has, by definition, occurred: the child has been "labeled" by virtue of being in contact with officials.

21. Many agency referrals may be referrals for counseling needs which are often not within the purview of child protective agencies.

22. It should be re-emphasized that multiple contacts occur most often in high-contact counties. Thus, in the analysis of multiple contacts and multiple disposition patterns, the four high-contact counties are over-represented.

23. We present data, here, only on high-contact counties as the N's become too small in the low-contact counties.

24. Alfaro has found that about one percent of children in New York come in contact with officials for juvenile offenses. In Monroe county, Alfaro was able to get more precise figures on the rate of juvenile contacts in the general population of those seven through seventeen years of age (not just those with a maltreatment contact). He found 1.9 percent of the general population of juveniles are in contact with officials for juvenile misconduct (Alfaro, personnel communication).

REFERENCES

Allen, Craig M. and Murray A. Straus
1975 "Resources, power, and husband-wife violence." Paper presented at the National Council on Family Relations 1975 Annual Meeting.

Alfaro, J.
1978 "The Relationship Between Child Abuse and Later Socially Deviant Behavior." Report to the New York State Assembly Select Committee on Child Abuse.

Bennie, E. and A. Sclare
1969 "The battered child syndrome." American Journal of Psychiatry, 125:975-979.

Bishop, R.I.
1971 "Children at risk." Medical Journal of Australia, 1: 623-628.

Blumberg, M.
1964-65 "When parents hit out." Twentieth Century, 173: 39-44.

Bowen, M.
1966 "The Use of family theory in clinical practice." Comprehensive Psychiatry, 7: 345-374.

Bowen, M.
1971 "Family therapy and family group therapy." In Kaplan, H.I. and Sadock, B.J. (eds.) Comprehensive Group Psycho Therapy. Baltimore: William and Wilkins.

Bryant, H.D., A. Billingsley, G.A. Kerry, W.V. Leefman, E.S. Merrill, G.R. Senecal and B.G. Walsh
1963 "Psysical Abuse of Children: An agency study." Child Welfare, 42: 125-130.

Caffey, J.
1946 "Multiple fractures of the long bones of infants suffering from chronic subdural haematoma." American Journal of Roentgenology, 56: 163-173.

Carr, A.
1977 "Some Preliminary Findings on the Association Between Child Maltreatment and Juvenile Misconduct in Eight New York Counties." A Report to the Administration for Children, Youth and Families: National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect.

Carr, A.
1978 "Reported child maltreatment in Florida: The Operation of Public Child Protective Service Systems," A Report submitted to the Administration on Children, Youth and Families, National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Carr, A.
1978 "Family Composition and its relation to child maltreatment and juvenile delinquency Paper presented at the third Annual Conference on Child Abuse and Neglect, New York April 17.

Craft, M.
1969 "The Natural history of psychopathic disorder." British Journal of Psychiatry, 115: 39-44.

Elmer, E.
1971 "Studies of child abuse and infants accidents." In U.S. National Institute of Mental Health, The Mental Health of the Child, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Elmer, E. and G.S. Gregg
1967 "Developmental characteristics of abused children." Pediatrics, 40: 596-602

Erlanger, Howard B.
1974 "Social Class and corporal punishment in child-rearing: A reassessment." American Sociological Review, 39 (February): 68-85.

Farrington, K.
1977 "Family violence and household density: Does the crowded home breed aggression?" Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, Chicago (August).

Flynn, W.R.
1970 "Frontier Justice: A contribution to the theory of child battery." American Journal of Psychiatry, 127: 375-379.

Friedrich, W.N. and J. A. Boriskin
1976 "The role of the child in abuse: A review of the literature." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 46(4): 580-590.

Galdston, R.
1965 "Observations on children who have been physically abused and their parents." American Journal of Psychiatry, 122: 440-443.

Gil, D.G.
1970 Violence against children: Physical child abuse in the United States. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Gil, D.G.
1975 "Unraveling Child Abuse." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 45: 352-355.

Green, A.H.
1968 "Self-destructive behavior in abused schizophrenic children: Report of cases. Archives of General Psychiatry, 19: 171-179.

Harrington, J.
1972 "Violence: A clinical viewpoint." British Medical Journal, 1: 228-231.

Helfer, R.E.
1974 "A self-instructional program on child abuse and neglect." Committee on Infant and Preschool Child, American Academy of Pediatrics, Chicago, Illinois.

Hirschi, T. and H.C. Selvin
1967 Delinquency Research: An Appraisal of Analytic Methods. New York: The Free Press.

Holter, J.C. and S.B. Friedman
1968 "Principles of management in child abuse cases." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 38(1): 127-138.

Jenkins, R.L., et al.
1970 "Interrupting the family cycle of violence." Journal of the Iowa Medical Society, 60(2): 85-89.

Johnson, B. and H.A. Morse
1968 "Injured children and their parents." Children, 15: 147-152.

Justice, B. and D.F. Duncan
1975 "Physical abuse of children as a public health problem." Public Health Reviews, 4: 183-200.

Justice, B. and R. Justice
1976 The Abusing Family. New York: Human Sciences Press.

Kempe, C.H.
1971 "Paediatric implications of the battered baby syndrome." Archieves of Disease in Childhood, 46 (28): 28-37.

Kempe, C.H. et al.
1962 "The Battered Child Syndrome." Journal of the American Medical Association, 181 (July 7): 17-24.

Kohen, Melvin L.
1969 Class and conformity. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press.

Lenoski, E.F.
1974 "Translating injury data into preventive and health care services -- Physical child abuse. Unpublished manuscript, University of Southern California School of Medicine.

1973 in Justice and Justice

Levinger, George
1966 "Sources of marital dissatisfaction among applicants for divorce." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 36 (October): 803-807.

Light, R.J.
1973 "Abused and Neglected children in America: A Study of alternative policies." Harvard Educational Review, 43: 559-588.

Lystadt, M.H.
1975 "Violence at Home: A review of the literature." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry." 45: 328-345.

Martin, H.P.
1972 "The child and his development." In C.H. Kempe and R.E. Helfer (eds.), Helping the Battered Child and his Family, Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Martin, H.P., P. Beezley, E. Conway and C.H. Kempe
1974 "The development of abused children: A reveiw of the literature and physical, neurological and intellectual outcomes." Advances in Pediatrics, 21: 25-73.

McKinley, D.G.
1964 Social class and family life. New York: The Free Press.

Melnick, B. and J.R. Hurley
1969 "Distinctive personality attributes of child abusing mothers." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33: 746-749.

Merril, E.J.
1962 Protecting the battered child. Denver: Children's Division, American Humane Association.

O'Brien, John E.
1971 "Violence in divorce prone families." Journal of Marriage and Family, 33 (November): 692-698.

Oliver, J.E. and A. Taylor
1971 "Five generations of ill-treated children in one family pedigree." British Journal of Psychiatry, 119: 473-480.

Owens, David M. and Murray A. Straus
1975 "The Social Structure of violence in childhood and approval of violence as an adult." Aggressive Behavior 1: 193-211.

Prescott, S. and C. Letko
1977 "Spouse violence: Factors Affecting women, children and marriage." Paper presented at the meeting of the Western Social Science Association, Denver (April).

Radbill, S.X.
1968 "A History of child abuse and infanticide." In R.E. Helfer and C.H. Kempe (eds.). The Battered Child (1st ed.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sanders, R.W.
1972 "Resistance to dealing with parents of battered children." Pediatrics, 50: 853-857.

Sandgrund, A., R. Gaines and A. Green
1974 "Child abuse and mental retardation: A problem of cause and effect." American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 79: 327-330.

Schloesser, P.
1964 "The abused child." Menninger Clinic Bulletin, 28: 260.

Sedgely, J.D.
1977 "Utilizing NORC data as an indicator of family violence." Paper presented at the meeting of the Western Social Science Association, Denver, April.

Soeffing, M.
1975 "Abused children are exceptional children." Exceptional children, 42: 126-133.

Silver, L.B., C.C. Dublin and R.S. Lourie
1969 "Does violence breed violence? Contributions from a study of the child abuse syndrome. American Journal of Psychiatry, 126: 404-407.

Spinetta, J.J. and D. Rigler
1972 "The child-abusing parent: A psychological review." Psychological Bulletin, 77: 296-304.

Steinmetz, S.K.
1977a The cycle of violence: Assertive, agressive and abusive family interaction. New York: Praeger.

Steinmetz, S.K.
1977b "The use of force for resolving family conflict: the training ground for abuse." The Family Coordinator, 26: 19-26.

Steinmetz, S.K.
1978 "Violence Between Family Members." Marriage & Family Review, 1(3): 2-16.

Steinmetz, S. and M. Straus
1971 "Some myths about violence in the family." Paper presented before the American Sociological Association, Denver.

Straus, M.A.
1976 "Societal morphogenesis and intrafamily violence in cross-cultural perspective." Annals of the New York Academy of Science.

Thompson, E.M., et al.
1971 Child abuse: A community challenge. East Aurora, N.Y.: Henry Stewart.

Wasserman, S.
1967 "The Abused parent of the abused child." Children, 14: 175-179.

Webb, E.J., D.T. Campbell, R.D. Schwartz, and L. Sechrest
1966 Unobatrusive Measures: Non-reactive Research in the Social Sciences. Chicago, Ill.: Rand McNally.

Wootton, Barbara
1959 Social Science and Social Pathology. New York: MacMillan.

Young, L.R.
1964 Wednesday's children: A study of child neglect and abuse. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Zalba, S.R.
1966 "The abused child: A survey of the problem." Social Work, 11: 3-16.

APPENDIX A

REFERRAL REASONS FOR CONTACTS WITH OFFICIAL AGENCIES IN NEW YORK

"Referral reason" means the act or acts or reason or reasons which brought the case to the agency's or Court's attention.

Child maltreatment (Abuse):

01 Brutally or continually battered -- bestial, extreme, vicious attack on child

02 Other physical attacks

03 Risks of physical injury to child

Child maltreatment (Other):

04 Sex offenses against child -- sexual abuse of child by parents

05 Impairment of mental and/or emotional health of child

06 Inadequate food, shelter and clothing, such as to impair the physical health of child, exclusive of malnutrition

07 Malnutrition

08 Inadequate educational care -- e.g. parents fail to insure that child attends school

09 Inadequate medical or surgical care

10 Abandonment or desertion

11 Involuntary parental absence -- e.g. jail or hospitalization of parent

12 Parental use of drugs

13 Parental alcoholism

14 Parental sexual misconduct

15 Parental mental illness, emotional disturbance or retardation

16 Parental fighting (verbal and/or physical)

17 Inadequate supervision, e.g. mother leaving home with child either unattended or in the care of another minor child

Juvenile offenses:

18 Homicide

19 Arson

20 Rape

21 Other sex crimes

22 Narcotics violation

23 Robbery -- steal from person

24 Burglary -- steal from house

25 Assault

26 Auto theft (only when specified as auto)

27 Unauthorized use of auto (joy riding)

28 Larceny, not auto

29 Dangerous weapons (possession and/or use of firearms)

30 Malicious mischief

31 Unlawful entry

32 Burglar's tools

33 Gambling

34 Receiving stolen property

35 Unlawful assembly

36 Disorderly conduct, e.g. loitering or abusive or obscene language, or harrassment

Status offenses/ungovernability:

37 Running away from home (including institution or foster home)

38 Habitual truancy

39 Refusal to obey

40 Sexual misconduct

41 Staying out late

42 Associating with bad companions

43 Using vile language (not to be confused with Disorderly conduct definition of abusive or obscene language, see code 36)

44 Intoxication

45 Glue sniffing

Other referral reasons:*

46 Other status offense

47 Placement (temporary or permanent)

48 Evaluation (psychiatric or medical)

49 Violation of probation

50 Family offenses

51 Non-support

52 Parent previously alleged to have abused or neglected a child

53 Parent previously alleged to have abused a child (in addition to specific child abuse or neglect reason, if known)

54 Parent previously reported as an abused or neglected child (in addition to specific child abuse or neglect reason, if known)

55 Other or unknown

56 Parents request for placement

* Other referral reasons 47 through 49 pertain to an agency referral, including parents and children. 50 through 56 pertain to parents only.